

for ✓

The American Catholic Sociological Review

Current back issues of THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW are indexed in the CATHOLIC PERIODICAL INDEX. The index to each volume is bound with the Dec. (No. 4) issue of each volume

Duke University Library

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APR 17 1952

CATHOLICS AS SOCIOLOGISTS	2
Thomas J. Harte, C.Ss.R.	Durham, N. C.
AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDUSTRY COUNCIL PLAN	10
George G. Higgins	
SOCIOLOGY IN THE MAJOR SEMINARY	25
The Program at Mt. St. Alphonsus Seminary by Joseph L. Kerins, C.Ss.R.; The Program at Our Lady of Angels Seminary by Herman Doerr, O.F.M.	
NEWS OF SOCIOLOGICAL INTEREST	39
BOOK REVIEWS	43
The Sociology of the Parish; Communism Versus the Negro; Intelligence and Cultural Differences; Moral Problems in Social Work; Types of Religious Experience; The Forgotten Language; English Life and Leisure; Society and Thought in Early America; American Sociology; The Sociology of Knowledge; Social Movements; The Meaning of Civilization; Social Philo- sophies of an Age of Crisis; The Claims of Sociology; Morals and Man in the Social Sciences; Testament for Social Science; Survey of Social Science; Sociology and Social Problems in Nursing Service; Marriage Education and Counseling; The Prac- tice of Marriage Counselling; Contemporary Correction; Behavior Pathology; The Social History of a War Boom Community; The American Veteran Back Home; The Social Welfare Forum, 1951; Progrès Scientifique et Service Social; The Children of Hari: A Study of the Nimar Balahis in the Central Provinces of India; Art of the Northwest Coast Indians; Short Notices.	
PERIODICAL REVIEWS	68

MARCH 1952

AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

Official Publication of the American Catholic Sociological Society

Editorial and Business Office: Loyola University, 820 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago 11, Illinois. All *business and editorial* communications should be sent to Rev. Ralph A. Gallagher, S.J., at this address. Address all communications concerning *book reviews* to Brother Gerald J. Schnepf, S.M., St. Louis University, St. Louis 3, Missouri.

EDITORIAL BOARD

RALPH A. GALLAGHER, S.J., *Chairman*
Loyola University, Chicago 11, Illinois

JOSEPH H. FICHTER, S.J.
Loyola University
New Orleans, Louisiana

PAUL HANLY FURFEY
Catholic University of America
Washington, D.C.

ERNEST KILZER, O.S.B.
St. John's University
Collegeville, Minnesota

SISTER MARY LIGUORI, B.V.M.
Mundelein College
Chicago, Illinois

PAUL MUNDY
Loyola University
Chicago, Illinois

RAYMOND W. MURRAY, C.S.C.
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

EVA J. ROSS
Trinity College
Washington, D.C.

JOHN L. THOMAS, S.J.
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

DONALD J. THORMAN
Loyola University
Chicago, Illinois

N. S. TIMASHEFF
Fordham University
New York, New York

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

BROTHER GERALD J. SCHNEPP, S.M., St. Louis University, St. Louis 3, Mo.

PERIODICAL REVIEWS EDITOR

GORDON ZAHN, Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D.C.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY OFFICERS

1952

Honorary President: Most Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, D.D., Kansas City, Mo.
President: John J. Kane, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.
First Vice-President: Rev. Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, S.J., Fordham University, New York, New York. *Second Vice-President:* Sister Mary Gabriel, G.N.S.H. D'Youville College, Buffalo, New York. *Executive Secretary:* Rev. Ralph A. Gallagher, S.J., Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois.
Members of the Executive Council: Bro. D. Augustine, F.S.C., La Salle College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Sister Mary Eduard, C.S.J., College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minnesota; Rev. Thomas J. Harte, C.Ss.R., Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.; Clement S. Mihanovich, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri; Sister Miriam Theresa, Marylhurst College, Marylhurst, Oregon; Sister Mary Roderic, F.S.P.A., Viterbo College, La Crosse, Wisconsin; Brother Gerald J. Schnepf, S.M., St. Louis University, St. Louis Missouri.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW is published quarterly, during the months of March, June, October, and December. Annual membership dues are \$5.00 for constituent (personal) and \$5.00 for institutional members; the annual dues include a subscription to the REVIEW. The subscription rate for non-members is \$3.00 a year. Foreign subscriptions are \$3.25. Single copies of the REVIEW are 75c. Make all checks payable to the American Catholic Sociological Society.

CONTENTS COPYRIGHTED, 1952





The American Catholic Sociological Review

Current back issues of THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW are indexed in the CATHOLIC PERIODICAL INDEX. The index to each volume is bound with the Dec. (No. 4) issue of each volume

Volume XIII

MARCH 1952

Number 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CATHOLICS AS SOCIOLOGISTS	2
Thomas J. Harte, C.Ss.R.	
AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDUSTRY COUNCIL PLAN	10
George G. Higgins	
SOCIOLOGY IN THE MAJOR SEMINARY	25
The Program at Mt. St. Alphonsus Seminary by Joseph L. Kerins, C.Ss.R.; The Program at Our Lady of Angels Seminary by Herman Doerr, O.F.M.	
NEWS OF SOCIOLOGICAL INTEREST	39
BOOK REVIEWS	43
<i>The Sociology of the Parish; Communism Versus the Negro; Intelligence and Cultural Differences; Moral Problems in Social Work; Types of Religious Experience; The Forgotten Language; English Life and Leisure; Society and Thought in Early America; American Sociology; The Sociology of Knowledge; Social Movements; The Meaning of Civilization; Social Philoso- phies of an Age of Crisis; The Claims of Sociology; Morals and Man in the Social Sciences; Testament for Social Science; Survey of Social Science; Sociology and Social Problems in Nursing Service; Marriage Education and Counseling; The Prac- tice of Marriage Counselling; Contemporary Correction; Behavior Pathology; The Social History of a War Boom Community; The American Veteran Back Home; The Social Welfare Forum, 1951; Progrès Scientifique et Service Social; The Children of Hari: A Study of the Nimar Balahis in the Central Provinces of India; Art of the Northwest Coast Indians; Short Notices.</i>	
PERIODICAL REVIEWS	68

CATHOLICS AS SOCIOLOGISTS*

Fifty-six years ago an event significantly related to our meeting took place on the campus of Catholic University. The *Year Book of the Catholic University of America, 1895-1896*, announced the establishment of a Faculty of Social Sciences, which was to take its place beside the already existing schools of Philosophy and Theology. The new Faculty was organized into departments of Ethics and Sociology, Political Economy, Political Science and Law. Two instructors were assigned to sociology, the Very Reverend Thomas Bouquillon, renowned professor of moral theology, and Reverend Frederic Z. Rooker, lecturer in Ethics. The announcement also outlined the curriculum offerings in sociology for the academic year 1895-1896, listing under its thirteen headings such titles as, "Sociology as a General Introduction to the Other Social Sciences," "The Social Being as an Organism in the Abstract," "Society in the Concrete," "Particular Civil Associations," "Particular Religious Associations," and "Social Systems." The recipient of the first degree in social science (Bachelor of Social Science), conferred in 1896, was a Negro student, Mr. William T. S. Jackson, who, in the words of a contemporary report, "made a very brilliant examination for this degree."¹

No claim is here made that the sociology taught in those early years at Catholic University should be classified as scientific sociology. For that matter, what Sumner and Small and others were then teaching was not so scientific either. Interesting and suggestive though the 1895 course titles may be, they are probably no more reliable as indexes to course content than similar listings in college catalogues today. Indeed, the selection of professors of theology and ethics as instructors for the new department makes it highly probable that these early offerings in sociology had a marked theological and ethical orientation.

* Paper read at the Thirteenth Annual Convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

¹ Boston *Pilot*, Dec. 12, 1896, as quoted in, Peter E. Hogan, S.S.J., *The Catholic University of America, 1896-1906* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1949), p. 99n.

Nevertheless, even the most sophisticated empirical scientists must admit that the event described is an historic one and, bearing in mind the intentions of the founders of this University, of signal importance in the development of sociology in the United States. In establishing a separate curricular sequence in sociology under the administrative jurisdiction of the Faculty of Social Sciences, the University formally recognized sociology as an independent discipline, academically distinct from, although perhaps substantially influenced by, philosophy and the sacred sciences. When it is recalled that sociology made its first American appearance as an academic subject at Yale in the year 1873, and that not more than six or seven universities included sociology in their curricula before 1890, the significance of Catholic University's pioneer action in the social sciences stands out in true perspective.²

Fifty-six years have elapsed, therefore, since the formal establishment of what was, most probably, the first department of sociology organized in a Catholic college or university in the United States. There may have been, of course, brief intervals in this half-century span when formal recognition was withdrawn, but these interruptions were of short duration. Acceptance of the new science by Catholic educators and scholars was slow and reluctant, yet final developments in this regard have been, if not spectacular, at least considerable. Professor L. L. Bernard, in his review of academic developments in sociology from 1895-1945, took special note of Catholic progress: "The change of Catholic educational policy in the matter naming courses with sociological content and listing them in a separate department of sociology is one of the outstanding trends in the teaching of sociology."³ The existence and apparent vigor of our thirteen-year-old American Catholic Sociological Society is a visible symbol of Catholic progress and accomplishment.

It is not the purpose of this paper to present a chronological account of our scientific progress, nor to attempt a definitive evaluation of our strength and weakness, of Catholic contributions or Catholic confusion in sociology.⁴ The time perspective is lacking for such an undertaking and, perhaps even more im-

² On the academic development of American sociology, see L. L. Bernard, "The Teaching of Sociology in the United States," *The American Journal of Sociology*, L (1945), 534-548.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 542.

portant, the makers of that history, or some of them at least, are still with us. They, not the writer, are the logical candidates for the task. Nevertheless, some notion of the gains made, of the accomplishments and failures of Catholic sociologists, can be had from returns on a recent survey of members of the American Catholic Sociological Society. These data are obviously incomplete (159 responses from 270 members) and therefore inadequate for unqualified generalizations about the sociology of Catholics or Catholic sociologists. Too many Catholic sociologists do not belong to the Society and too many members failed to answer their questionnaires. Within these unavoidable limitations a fragmentary appraisal of what Catholics are doing or have done in academic sociology will now be attempted.

In the three year period 1949-1951, 60 Catholic colleges represented by the respondents conferred the Bachelor's degree on 1943 student majors in sociology. During the next few years these institutions will graduate an estimated 2400 young men and women with the same degree. Over that three year period, 1949-1951, 124 Master of Arts and 29 Doctor of Philosophy degrees in sociology were conferred by seven reporting institutions of higher learning. According to our reports these same institutions will turn out in the next two or three years approximately 235 Master's and 58 Doctoral degrees. While it is true that the number of sociology degrees, undergraduate or graduate, constitute a relatively small percentage of all degrees conferred in a given period by the institutions included (hardly comparable, for example, to the number granted in the humanities or physical sciences), yet this number is certainly striking in view of the relative youth of sociology as an academic subject and the limited employment opportunities for Catholic specialists in sociology.

College catalogue announcements of course offerings in sociology are questionable indices to what is really taught, yet some observations based on these sources are justified. An examination of 53 current catalogues revealed one striking fact:⁴ there is little uniformity or standardization in the sociology programs of these Catholic colleges. Although over one hundred different titles are listed as sociology subjects, there is not a single course

⁴ Melvin J. Williams, *Catholic Social Thought* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1950), contains much useful material on this point.

which is listed in all 53 colleges. Introductory Sociology or General Principles, Social Problems, and Marriage and the Family are the only courses which are almost universally accepted. Not more than a dozen courses altogether are offered by half of the colleges included. Titles from other academic disciplines — anthropology, economics, political science, psychology, social work and surprisingly, physical education — are sometimes offered in departments of sociology. A certain flexibility in curriculum content to meet specialized community and student needs is, of course, desirable; yet the lack of uniformity and standardization in the types of courses offered and in teacher presentation of subject matter is, undoubtedly, a serious defect of the sociology program in Catholic colleges. Those of us with some experience in teaching on the graduate level are keenly aware of the fact that there are marked differences from one college to another in the kind of preparation given to students.

One basic index to the adequacy of an educational program is the qualification of the teaching personnel. Sociology teachers in Catholic colleges are recruited largely, as might be expected, from the ranks of the clergy and religious. Only 32 (28.8%) of the 111 teacher-respondents to the ACSS questionnaire were lay persons. Assuming the operation of differing principles of teacher selection for these two categories, the clerical-religious and the lay (members of the former category sometimes being assigned involuntarily to sociology while members of the latter freely choose sociology as a career), it is quite possible that there may be a differential in the teaching capacity of the two groups. Unfortunately, the data on hand shed no light on this problem. Similarly, while the numerical superiority of priests and religious over lay teachers may reflect a theological and philosophical orientation in sociology on the one hand, the same factor may also point up the extent of Catholic acceptance of the once-dreaded sociology. The "clericalism" of the sociology personnel in Catholic schools probably results from sheer economic necessity rather than from any systematic effort to baptize the science. All of us have known priest and nun sociologists who are good sociologists by any standard; all of us too have known

⁵ Teacher-respondents to the questionnaire were asked to supply current editions of their college catalogues. Catalogues from 53 Catholic colleges were obtained in this manner.

lay sociologists whose primary interests were in social philosophy or theology or social policy.

Sociology in Catholic colleges and universities has a commendable record in terms of the technical requirement of faculty degrees. One hundred and eleven teachers of sociology on the college level answered the questionnaire. Of these 66 (59.5%) had received doctoral degrees, 43 (38.7%) master's degrees, and the remaining two were working toward a graduate degree. A more realistic approach to the problem of evaluating the college sociology program in terms of teacher qualifications must take into account the teacher's specialized preparation in his own field. Here again our Catholic college teachers of sociology, or better, those who responded to the questionnaire, are apparently fairly well equipped to handle their assignments. Thirty-five (81.5%) of the teacher respondents with master's degrees had made their graduate studies in sociology and three more (8.0%) had done some graduate work in this field. Of these 66 teachers with doctoral degrees, 51 (77.3%) had taken their degrees in sociology, 13 others (19.7%) had taken some graduate work in sociology and only two had no graduate preparation for their work. These same data can be summarized by saying that about 98% of the teacher respondents to the questionnaire are qualified to teach by at least a Master's degree; 77% are especially qualified by at least a Master's degree in sociology; and approximately 92% can offer the minimum qualification of some work in sociology on the graduate level. The results on this point of teacher qualifications are indeed encouraging; yet it is important to bear in mind that the findings only refer to teacher members of the ACSS who responded to the questionnaire. There is no way of determining how representative these respondents are of all teachers of sociology in Catholic colleges.

College teachers are frequently called upon to offer courses in more than one specialty at the same time, sometimes in entirely unrelated subjects. This diffusion of interests and energies can have adverse influence on teachers and students alike. Teacher-respondents on the ACSS survey fared surprisingly well in this respect. One hundred seven college teachers supplied a listing of courses offered by them in the five year period ending August 31, 1951. Of the 943 courses offered by this group, 660 (69.9%), may, by liberal definition of the field, be classified as belonging in sociology. Almost all of the remaining courses were offered in related science fields: economics, history, political science, psychology, or social work.

A further occupational hazard in the teaching profession is school administration. From the point of view of good scholarship sociology teachers do not seem to fare well in this respect. Forty-three (38.7%) of the 111 college teachers in the survey held a variety of administrative positions, such as deans of men, of women and of studies, college presidents, chaplains, departmental heads, etc.

In appraising the achievements of Catholic sociologists in the United States it is hardly possible to forego consideration of their research and scholarly productivity as a measure of professional success. This involves, understandably, some major difficulties. For example, the statement of one respondent to the survey, "I am a teacher first and last, not a writer," crystallizes an area of disagreement between those who defend and those who deny the importance of scholarship or research to effective teaching. Although subscribing completely to the view that there is an intimate relationship between personal scholarship and distinguished teaching on the college and university levels, this writer would also admit, with every honest scholar, that the "publish or perish credo" in academic circles is sometimes over-emphasized. Research motivated merely by an immediate desire for publication which, in turn, becomes a stepping stone to promotions, and ultimately to financial security and higher status in the school community, this kind of research may be only remotely related to the honest quest for truth.⁶

It is reasonable to expect, on the other hand, that trained Catholic sociologists, particularly teachers in colleges and universities, will cultivate an intense interest in their chosen field, and that this interest will find at least occasional expression in a scholarly publication. Sociological research has extended considerably the scope of man's knowledge about society. Yet there is no dearth of social research problems remaining, just as there is no lack of stimuli, whether intellectual, academic, professional, or religious, to spur the Catholic sociologist to engage in social research. A legitimate question is in order at this point: do Catholic sociologists measure up to what may be reasonably expected of them as scholars and as scientists?

Even the most loyal partisans in our midst will answer

⁶ Logan Wilson, *The Academic Man* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942), presents a very suggestive discussion of this point, particularly in chap. xi.

emphatically in the negative, a conclusion which is supported substantially by the limited returns to the ACSS questionnaire. Of the 158 respondents who supplied material on this point, only 76 (48.1%) had ever published any books, or brochures, or had contributed any scholarly or professional articles within the past five years. Published dissertations are not included in this breakdown. The performance of college teachers was, as could be expected, better than average. Sixty-three of the 111 in this category (56.7%) had some publication to their credit. Further breakdowns of these data fail to improve the general picture of scholarly unproductivity. Only 39 respondents have written or co-authored a book, but these 39 elect have produced an imposing total of 127 volumes. It should also be pointed out, however, that 69 (54.3%) of these publications were the work of seven respondents, all of whom have written from five to fifteen books or scholarly brochures during their lifetime. With regard to periodical publication, 59 of the 158 respondents (37.3%) have had one or more articles published in a Catholic professional or scholarly magazine in the past five years. Such periodicals as *The American Catholic Sociological Review*, *Thought*, *American Ecclesiastical Review*, *The Catholic Educational Review*, etc., were included in this category. Twenty-four respondents (15.2%) have had their writings accepted by secular scientific or professional journals.

The findings on unpublished research being conducted by members of the Society are quite similar to those on publication. Only 54 respondents (34.2%) listed by unpublished research. The total number of research projects, including those in progress, already completed, or in preparation for publication at the time the questionnaire was returned, was 104.

It is necessary to stress the fact that these findings on research and publication are based on the gross data supplied by respondents to the survey. No attempt was made to distinguish publications on research projects in the field of sociology from those in other fields, nor between the strictly scientific and other types, such as textbooks, nor was any serious effort made to eliminate the many non-scholarly, non-scientific publications included. The conclusion is unavoidable that the record of respondents to the survey on the matter of research and publication is far from commendable.

For some, admittedly, the practical application of their socio-

logical training and knowledge may have a stronger appeal than scholarship as such. An attempt was made to measure this factor by asking respondents to the questionnaire to list the extracurricular programs and activities in which they participated as sociologists during the five-year period ending in 1951. Of the 158 respondents answering the questions on this point, 70 (44.3%) indicated some participation. Forty-five (27.5%) of these indicated some activity on Catholic sponsored programs, and 52 (32.9%) participated on civic or public programs. The kind of participation listed by respondents varied considerably, some indicating a single address before a local group, others reporting numerous permanent memberships on regional or national committees, both Catholic and secular. A high proportion of those who rendered some such professional services were also among those most active in research and publication.

There is, in conclusion, good reason for Catholic sociologists today to be proud of their accomplishments; there is good reason too for humility in recognizing their shortcoming and failings. Much has been achieved in the fifty-six years that have elapsed since sociology was first accorded academic status in a Catholic school: rather widespread recognition of sociology as a legitimate discipline for inclusion in the school curriculum; the staffing of schools with competent, qualified teachers of sociology; the emergence of individual Catholic sociologists whose ability and scholarship commands the respect of all. Credit is doubly due for these gains because they were made in the face of heavy odds — heavier, perhaps, than those encountered by any of the newer sciences.

These accomplishments must be balanced, in all fairness, against some serious liabilities. Among these should be mentioned a penchant, in teaching and writing, for the easier course of overemphasis on the "what-ought-to-be" to the neglect of patient analysis of "what is;"⁷ smug satisfaction with what is, not infrequently, second-rate scholarship for ourselves and for our students; and, finally, professional inertia and apathy towards social research. If Catholic sociologists have failed to win the respect of their fellow-scientists or the esteem of their colleagues in Catholic institutions the fault lies, in great part, with the Catholic sociologists.

THOMAS J. HARTE, C.Ss.R.

The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

⁷ For a very forthright statement on this attitude see Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, S.J., "Catholic Responsibilities in Sociology," *Thought*, XXVI, (1951), 384-96.

AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDUSTRY COUNCIL PLAN*

The well-known German commentator on the social encyclicals, Father Gustav Gundlach, S.J., of the Gregorian University in Rome, recently stated at a public conference in Essen, Germany, that the United States is not prepared for a true understanding of the idea of the "vocational order" (industry council plan) and still less for its realization. The relevant text of his statement reads as follows:

The Church believes — as follows from "Quadragesimo Anno" — that with the idea of the "vocational order" it shows to the anti-capitalistic tendencies of our age a positive road which avoids the negative and pseudo-solutions of socialism or communism. The necessity to walk this road can be denied only by those who believe that the free market economy could be saved by providing for judicial authority against the positions of power in the market. Such a course may seem still possible in a country like the United States, where the spaciousness of the territory and the abundance of natural resources still allow it to circumvent all frictions of a more serious character, or easily to overcome the harm done by them. But over there the anti-capitalistic tendencies are not yet powerful either; an almost naive trust in unlimited progress still holds its sway there; as a consequence, there exist neither the real nor the moral prerequisites for a true understanding of the idea of the "vocational order," and still less for its realization.

Salva reverentia, the speaker would like to suggest, tentatively, at least, that Father Gundlach's analysis of the contemporary socio-economic situation in the United States is somewhat less than adequate. It would not be unfair, I think, to character-

* Paper read at the Thirteenth Annual Convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

¹ "The Social Question as Seen from Rome," address to the Social Meeting of the Catholic People of Germany, Fall, 1951. Mimeographed translation available from the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C.

ize it as an analysis not of the *status quo*, but of the *status quo ante* — ante-depression and ante-World Wars I and II. It is not suggested that Father Gundlach's interpretation of the contemporary economic situation in the United States is altogether incorrect. The factors which he finds to be militating against the establishment of the "vocational order" do exist at the present time, but they exist, I submit, in a rather attenuated form and, even more significantly, they exist side by side with important post-depression and post-war factors which are at least potentially favorable to the establishment of the industry council plan. One example will suffice to illustrate the point I am attempting to make. If I understand Father Gundlach correctly, he seems to be saying that the United States attaches exaggerated importance to the effectiveness of anti-monopoly legislation as a means of regulating, if not altogether eliminating, "positions of power in the market." This might have been true twenty or thirty years ago, but surely there must be relatively few Americans in 1951 who are not convinced — privately at least, no matter what they may say publicly in deference to the American mythology — that anti-monopoly legislation is a rather superficial and ineffective remedy for the imperfections of the market. I should imagine that a minority of government lawyers in the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice and a minority of professional economists are just about the only people of importance who seriously subscribe at this late date to the philosophy of free competition upon which our anti-monopoly legislation presumably is based and for the protection of which, presumably, it was originally enacted. Corporation lawyers, corporation executives, union officers and the leaders of our great farm organizations — these four groups really don't believe in the "formalistic market idea of the old economic liberalism" any more than Father Gundlach does. The language of their press releases and other public utterances to the contrary notwithstanding, their actions would seem to indicate that they believe in a surprisingly large measure of economic planning — however violently they may repudiate the term itself and however piously they may genuflect before the idols of economic liberalism when they are called upon in public to articulate their beliefs.

I hope I will not be interpreted as suggesting that our anti-monopoly legislation ought to be repealed at this time or that our present system of unilaterally regulated or "administered" markets is necessarily an improvement on the *status quo ante*. I am merely saying — this and nothing more for the moment — that Father Gundlach, by reason of a somewhat inadequate understanding of the present economic situation in the United States, seems to me to have miscalculated our readiness for a true understanding of the idea of the "vocational order" and for its realization.

I will not pause to enumerate the factors which lead me to be somewhat more optimistic than Father Gundlach is about our readiness for the industry council plan in the United States. Suffice it to say, for the limited purposes of this paper, that the economic *status quo* at any given period of time — or, more accurately, our own understanding or interpretation of the *status quo* — will almost inevitably influence, to some extent at least, our interest in promoting or in promoting the industry council plan. This is not to say that economic facts are more important than social principles or theories. It is merely to suggest that even Catholic social reformers — or, should I say, Catholics especially — are inclined to place their emphasis at any given time, on those phases of their social philosophy which seem to have a reasonable chance to being implemented under existing conditions.

It would seem to follow, therefore, that if American Catholic social reformers were to accept Father Gundlach's analysis of our present economic situation, they would probably be inclined to postpone the all-out emphasis on the industry council plan which the speaker, for one, finds to be warranted by his own somewhat different analysis of the *status quo* — not only warranted but required, if you will, by the necessities of the moment.

This has been a round-about way of introducing the working hypothesis around which we have constructed our brief address on the disconcertingly big subject "American Contributions to the Implementation of the Industry Council Plan."

American contributions to the implementation of the industry council plan, whatever else may be said about them, are all relatively recent. Our own research, if we may presume to call it that, has been limited roughly to the period beginning with

the emergence of the late Monsignor John A. Ryan as the leading exponent of Catholic social teaching in the United States. I am told by my colleagues that Father Peter Dietz and certain other pioneers who were influenced by the German Catholic tradition had begun to promote the industry council plan in the United States before the time of Monsignor Ryan. A superficial examination of the record, however, leads me to conclude tentatively and subject to correction that Dietz and his contemporaries were only casually interested in the industry council plan, if indeed they were interested in it at all. Their primary emphasis seems to have been placed on what we would call labor-management cooperation and various other limited proposals designed to foster class cooperation and thereby undermine the influence of socialism, which, incidentally, was more of a problem in the United States in those days — or seemed to be at least — than it has been or seemed to be at almost any other time during the intervening decades. With the exception of this one unscholarly and very tentative reference to the period symbolized by Father Dietz we will confine our analysis exclusively to the period extending from the time of Monsignor Ryan.

Ryan himself is a good illustration of our working hypothesis. It would be accurate to say that Ryan did not become seriously interested in the industry council plan — or in the general problem of social reconstruction or social reorganization — until the 30's. He himself has told us why in the 1919 Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction — of which he was the anonymous author. "No attempt will be made in these pages," the Bishops' Program says, "to formulate a comprehensive scheme of reconstruction. Such an undertaking would be a waste of time as regards immediate needs and purposes, for no important group or section of the American people is ready to consider a program of this magnitude. Attention will therefore be confined to those reforms that seem to be desirable and also obtainable within a reasonable time, and to a few general principles which should become a guide to more distant developments. A statement thus circumscribed will not merely present the objects which we wish to see obtained, but will also serve as an imperative call to action."

The best available analysis of the gradual development or

evolution of Ryan's position over the course of the years is an unpublished Catholic University doctoral dissertation (in preparation) entitled, *The Economic Thought of Monsignor John A. Ryan*, by Father Patrick W. Gearty of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minnesota. Gearty summarizes as follows the several stages through which Monsignor Ryan passed en route to his eventual interest in the industry council plan:

Ryan (says Gearty) conceived the basic idea of a system of *economic democracy* as early as 1909 and he defined it as a movement toward a more general and equitable distribution of economic power and goods and opportunities. His development of this concept has four principal stages or phases which are cumulative in effect. The first stage is characterized by emphasis upon social reform by legislation and also by labor unions. Both legislation and labor unions continued to hold a basic place in Ryan's concept of economic democracy. Some of the legislative measures advocated by Ryan as early as 1909 include minimum wage and hour laws; legal protection of the right of workers to organize; public employment agencies; social security against unemployment, sickness, and old age; public housing projects; public ownership of public utilities, and the regulation of monopolies and exchange markets. Eventually Ryan saw practically all of these put into effect by President Franklin D. Roosevelt's "New Deal" administration, in which Ryan himself took an active part. The second phase of Ryan's concept of economic democracy dates from about the time of his serialized debate with socialist Morris Hillquit in 1913 and 1914. At this time Ryan began emphasizing the necessity of widespread ownership of productive property in order to promote individual welfare and social stability. His plan for widespread ownership included the proposal for at least partial ownership of the means of production by the workers, consumer and producer cooperatives, and an increased number of small farm units. By the end of World War I Ryan had developed a new phase of economic democracy consisting of a carefully worked out plan whereby the workers would share in the ownership, management, and/or profits of industry. The fourth and final phase of Ryan's concept of economic democracy received its major impetus from Pope Pius's encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931), wherein the Holy Father advocated an organic social order composed of autonomous occupational groups. Although Ryan had previously referred to groups composed of employers and workers of the same industry as an ideal arrangement, this idea received little emphasis in his writings prior to the publication of the encyclical. In

his later years he advocated this plan for "industrial self-government" as the only ultimate solution for a rational economic order.

Gearty says that the fourth and final phase of Ryan's concept of economic democracy received its major impetus from *Quadragesimo Anno*. Perhaps. Or did it receive its major impetus from the great depression, which inevitably forced the American people to do what the Bishops' Statement says they were unprepared to do in 1919, namely, formulate a comprehensive scheme of social reconstruction? What I am trying to say is that *Quadragesimo Anno* fell upon fertile soil. It made its appearance, providentially, at that very moment when, for the first time in the history of the United States, there existed (if I may take certain liberties with Father Gundlach's text) at least some of the real and some of the moral prerequisites for a true understanding of the idea of the "vocational order" as well as for its realization.

After 1931 Ryan increasingly stressed in his voluminous writings the importance of the industry council plan, but it would be difficult to determine whether or not he made any original contribution to the practical development of the plan in the United States. He clarified its underlying principles, to be sure, and thanks to his personal reputation as an outstanding progressive, was probably able to do more than any other single individual to answer effectively the all too common accusation that the industry council plan is at least semi-fascist. Even at the end of his career, however, he probably did not think quite so instinctively in industry council terms as would some of his disciples and associates, notably Father Raymond McGowan and the then Monsignor Francis J. Haas. Ryan, to be sure, was among the first to call attention to the possibility of transforming the National Industrial Recovery Act into a genuine industry council plan. A paragraph which he devotes to this subject in his autobiography is still a model of brevity and precision:

... a comprehensive reading of American history will disclose that the reform measures enacted since the spring of 1933 constitute a greater advance toward a regime of social justice than the whole body of reform legislation previously passed since the adoption of the Constitution.

However, the enactment which interested me most and from which I expected most, endured less than two

years. The National Industrial Recovery Act was passed June 16, 1933, and was declared unconstitutional May 27, 1935. The National Recovery Administration provided for a forty-hour week, minimum-wage rates, right of labor to bargain collectively, fair business practices, a considerable measure of industrial self-government, and by implication it espoused and promoted the purchasing-power theory of business prosperity and economic welfare. More than once during those two years I pointed out the similarity between the institutions of N.R.A. and the constituent elements of the occupational group system. I contended that the plan recommended by Pope Pius XI was more radical, more democratic, and more desirable than N.R.A. as actually set up and functioning, and that the chief defect in N.R.A. structure was its failure, except in a minority of the industries, to give adequate representation to the employees. I still believe that if N.R.A. had been permitted to continue, it could readily have developed into the kind of industrial order recommended by Pope Pius XI.²

The National Industrial Recovery Act was declared unconstitutional in 1935. From that time on until his death in 1946 Ryan continued, of course, to advocate the industry council plan and indeed wrote one of the better books on the subject in the year 1935, entitled *A Better Economic Order*. Even so, it would be fair to say, I think, that Ryan's interest in the industry council plan was overshadowed, to some extent at least, by his practical-minded interest in immediate reforms — some of which, of course, were absolutely necessary prerequisites for the industry council plan.

The one man of my own acquaintance who thinks most naturally — or, if you will, most instinctively — in terms of the industry council plan is Monsignor Ryan's long-time associate and assistant, Father Raymond McGowan. Father McGowan was advocating the industry council plan before *Quadragesimo Anno*. After *Quadragesimo Anno* he was one of the first Americans, I think, to grasp the full significance of the encyclical program and social reconstruction and one of the first to begin to think realistically about its application to the American economy. Two of his publications will stand up even today as being among the most valuable commentaries on the Papal program. I refer to two booklets entitled "Toward Social Justice" and "Organized

²*Social Doctrine in Action* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941), pp. 248-249.

Social Justice." The latter, although written by Father McGowan, was published anonymously and was signed by 131 prominent Americans from all walks of life. It was proposed to the American public as an economic program for the United States applying Pius XI's teaching on the vocational order.

Father McGowan's distinctive contribution to the development of the industry council plan in the United States cannot be properly estimated without a passing reference to his long tenure as Executive Secretary of the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems. Through the medium of the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems — as well as through the medium of unnumbered personal and group talks — Father McGowan has emphasized, as few others have done, the importance of the industry council plan and has emphasized, more than most other commentators, what he likes to call the process of growth towards the establishment of the industry council plan in the United States. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to document his contribution to the cause, but I would be prepared to defend the conclusion that he has done more to create an audience for the encyclical program than almost any other American Catholic, including Monsignor Ryan. A minimum of documentation in support of this conclusion is available in the form of two Catholic dissertations on the work of the Social Action Department, a large part of which, as Monsignor Ryan himself testifies in his autobiography, was initiated by Father McGowan. The titles of the two dissertations are as follows: *The Work of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference* by Sylvia M. Batdorf and *The Work of the Social Action Department in Industrial Relations, 1935-42* by Rev. James Lee. The latter dissertation, in particular, is valuable for its enumeration of the various attempts made by Father McGowan to bring together representatives of labor, management, agriculture, the professions and government in joint conferences to discuss ways and means of establishing the industry council plan in the United States.

Monsignor Francis J. Haas — now the Bishop of Grand Rapids — was closely associated with Monsignor Ryan and Father McGowan in promoting the industry council plan, particularly after he moved to Washington to become the Director of the National Catholic School of Social Service and later Dean of the School of Social Science at the Catholic University of

America. Bishop Hass, like Father McGowan, has placed a great deal of emphasis upon American approximations to the industry council plan and indeed directed the writing of a well-known dissertation on this subject by Father Joseph Munier of San Francisco.³ The Bishop had an unparalleled opportunity to get to know both industry and government from the inside, thanks to his widespread experience as a government conciliator and thanks to his membership on numerous government boards and commissions. This experience enabled him to see, more clearly perhaps than many academicians, both the need for the industry council plan and the possibility of our growing into it by improving upon and expanding upon successful approximations. His interest in the industry council plan has been reflected over the years in his writing and lecturing as well as in his teaching at the Catholic University of America where he inspired the preparation of Father Munier's dissertation and another important dissertation by Father Harold Trehey entitled, *Foundations of a Modern Catholic System*. A useful summary of the Bishop's thinking on the industry council plan is set forth in some detail as Chapters 13 and 14 of the revised edition of his well-known book entitled *Man and Society*.

With no intention of indulging in odious or invidious comparisons, I would single out these three men — Ryan, McGowan and Haas — as the three Americans who have made the most significant contribution to the development of the industry council plan in the United States. I realize, of course, that this is a debatable proposition and one that I have not adequately documented in my cursory analysis of their activities. It goes without saying, of course, that they were not alone in the field during the 30's — witness, for example, Father Bruehl, Father Husslein, and many others — but it seems to me that they set the pace and prepared the way for the rest of us. They kept the home fires burning, as it were, when all too few professional Catholic economists and Catholic journalists — let us face it — were seriously concerned about the industry council plan. After 1940 the tide began to turn. In that year the Bishops of the United States issued their statement on "The Church and Social Order," and from then until the present time interest in the

³ *Some American Approximations to Pius XI's "Industries and Professions"* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1943).

subject of the industry council plan has increased by leaps and bounds.

It would be impossible for any of us, I think, to analyze adequately the particular contributions which have been made between 1940 and the present time by the many individuals and groups which have been and are currently active in promoting the industry council plan. The best I can possibly do is to mention some of them by name.

Among the individual writers who ought to be mentioned — again at the conscious risk of slighting many others — are Father John F. Cronin, S.S.; Father Raymond Miller, C.Ss.R.; Father William Ferree, S.M.; Father Wilfred Parsons, S.J.; Father Joseph Munier, Father Harold Trehey, and a growing number of Jesuit economists, particularly those associated with the development of the Institute of Social Order and its admirable monthly publication, *Social Order*. All of these men, and others too numerous to mention, have written extensively on the industry council plan and have helped to promote a better understanding of it in American Catholic circles.

Among the organizations and periodicals most deserving of mention are the following:

- The Association of Catholic Trade Unionists
- The Chicago Catholic Labor Alliance
- The Industry Council Plan Committee of the American Catholic Sociological Society
- The Catholic Economic Association
- The Catholic Business Education Association
- The Institute of Social Order
- The Industry Council Association, Inc., established by Father William Kelley, O.M.I.

The Catholic Institute of the Food Industries, inspired and kept alive by Mr. John Quincy Adams, Catholic employer with a profound understanding of the principle of the apostolate of like to like.

America

The Commonweal

Rather than attempt the hopeless task of evaluating the specific contributions of any of these individuals, periodicals or organizations, I will conclude with a series of hasty generalizations on the problem as a whole.

(1) I think we ought to pay more attention to the writings of those non-Catholic social scientists who seem to be heading in the direction of the industry council plan, even though they may never use the term and even though they may reject the teaching authority of the Church in the field of social morality. As you know, the Industry Council Plan Committee of the Catholic Sociological Society has already begun, on a modest scale, to sample the attitude of secular economists on the subject of the industry council plan. Others — including Mr. James O'Gara of Loyola University in Chicago and Professor Joseph Flubacher of LaSalle College in Philadelphia — are either conducting or directing surveys of secular economic literature for the purpose of discovering approximations to the industry council plan. I myself have found such approximations in the following books and articles, which are listed merely for the sake of illustration:

The New Federalism by Judge Samuel Seabury (Dutton).

Guideposts in Time of Change by John Maurice Clark (Harper).

Alternative to Serfdom by John Maurice Clark (Knopf).

Social Control of Business by John Maurice Clark (University of Chicago Press). (There are scattered references in this volume to the industry council approach, although obviously the words "industry council" aren't used. See in particular Chapter 29. Also see pp. 65, 239, and 271).

Authority and Responsibility of Business by Edward A. Duddy. (The Winter, 1950 issue of the magazine *Measure* — published by the Henry Regnery Company in Chicago).

The Dynamics of Industrial Democracy by Golden and Ruttenberg (Harper).

Organized Labor and Production by M. L. Cooke and Philip Murray (Harper).

The Annual Reports of the Council of Economic Advisors. (In several of the Reports of the Council of Economic Advisors there are at least vague and tentative references to the necessity for some kind of organized cooperation between the various groups and government).

The Only Way — A Study of Democracy in Danger by Alexander Loveday (William Hodge and Company of London). (On page 134 you will find a very strong emphasis on the function of organized voluntary cooperation in the economic order

— similar to the emphasis in Maritain's new book, *Man and the State*, published by the University of Chicago Press).

The Union Challenge to Management Control by Neil Chamberlain (Harper). "The Organized Business in America" by Neil Chamberlain (*Journal of Political Economy*, Volume LII, No. 2).

Professor Chamberlain's approach, it seems to me, is typical of a very encouraging trend in the right direction. As a specialist in the field of labor economics, Chamberlain knows that the subject matter as well as the geographical area of collective bargaining is expanding very rapidly and will probably continue to expand indefinitely in the future. He sees three very important trends in American industry; the rise of self-government in business; the extension of union control into all fields of managerial discretion; and the expansion of the area of negotiations into industry-wide collective bargaining.

"If these three trends are correlated . . .," Chamberlain says in a very important article, written in 1944 but only recently brought to our attention, "there emerges the suggestion of a pattern of industrial organization resembling a loose system of industrial corporatism."⁴

Many of Chamberlain's fellow economists are frightened by this gradual but consistent trend towards "a loose system of industrial corporatism." They look upon it as a trend in the direction of Fascism. Chamberlain, on the contrary — to his very great credit as an objective social scientist — isn't one to be taken in by slogans. This trend towards industry-wide self-government — with labor and management co-operatively establishing and administering the rules — could go either way, he says. He refuses to be doctrinaire about the matter.

"Should the budding organized industry of America ever blossom into full flower . . .," Chamberlain argues, "we may expect that this indigenous plant will have its own characteristics, and we may find that it can be made a tool of the democratic as well as of the Fascist state. We cannot assume, but it may prove to be true, that the organized industry will open

⁴"The Organized Business in America," *Readings in Labor Economics*, ed. by Francis S. Doody (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, Inc.), p. 206. The article originally appeared in the *Journal of Political Economy*, June, 1944.

up a possibility of industrial democracy which will provide a concomitant to the political democracy of the state."⁵

Chamberlain doesn't pretend to be a prophet. He is a scholar — with an open mind and a wholesome distaste for superficial slogans. "The only point being made . . .," he says, "is that there is no reason to assume a priori that if organized industries arise in this country they are necessarily opposed in principle to the democratic state."⁶

(2) Even more important than what the economists, Catholic or non-Catholic, say about the industry council plan or approximations thereof is what the organized economic groups in the United States do about it. They are the ones who will ultimately decide whether, when, and how it is to be established and how it is to function. Thus the importance of our doing everything possible to encourage unions, trade associations and farmer organizations to begin thinking along industry council lines is obvious. We are doomed to one disappointment or frustration after another, however, if we expect these organizations to approach the subject on a purely philosophical or ideological basis. Their approach will inevitably be much more pragmatic than that of professional social scientists. I hold no special brief for the philosophical or ideological innocence of American economic organizations. I would hazard the opinion, however, that their very pragmatism may turn out to be a blessing in disguise. It may function as a guarantee that if and when we do establish the industry council plan in the United States it will be characterized by voluntary agreement all along the line and will not be imposed from the top down by excessive governmental intervention. Far better, I should think, to make haste slowly, moving from one approximation to the next, than to establish, overnight as it were, an authoritarian corporative system à la Portugal or Spain.

It seems to me, therefore, that our educational program and our university research projects ought to concentrate more and more on helping labor, management, agriculture and the professions to understand the necessity and to recognize the possibility of developing more and more approximations to the industry council plan, approximations which will be suggested by their every given experience with successful methods of col-

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 207.

⁶ *Ibid.*

lective bargaining and successful types of cooperation between voluntary economic organizations and government.

The outlook is not altogether pessimistic, as Dr. Chamberlain has suggested in the article previously referred to. To be sure, the underlying philosophy of most of our economic organizations is usually very vague and sometimes very selfish. Nevertheless there is more than a little evidence that some of these organizations may be moving however gradually and unconsciously, in the right direction. Nor has all of the progress been unconscious. Some organizations have articulated a philosophy which at least approximates the philosophy of *Quadragesimo Anno*. For the purposes of this discussion we need mention only one example — official CIO resolutions on the industry council plan. Those who are interested in studying the CIO proposal in greater detail are referred to a recent Catholic University dissertation by Father Leonard Williams of San Francisco entitled, *The CIO Industry Council Plan As an Approximation to Pius XI's Industries and Professions*. Father Williams' concluding summary is encouraging. "Our evaluation of the CIO Industry Council Plan," he says, "has led us to the conclusion that there is a real approximation to (the program of *Quadragesimo Anno*) but not full harmony."

The CIO proposal, as of now, is still in the theoretical stage and is hardly ever referred to between conventions. Nevertheless it is better than nothing and can serve, for the purposes of this discussion, as a useful reminder of the importance of our functional economic organizations as potential building blocks in the new social order and the importance of directing our education and research to the particular needs and requirements of these organizations.

(3) I would suggest that the time has arrived for a well-organized attempt to pool our efforts systematically with the view to developing a more scientific approach to the implementation of the industry council plan as opposed to a mere explanation of its principles, however necessary the latter type of work may be. To the best of my knowledge, very little scientific research is being carried on in this field, and the little that is being done appears to be rather hit-and-miss. Perhaps the Catholic Sociological Society, the Catholic Economic Association, and the Catholic Business Education Association could co-operate in working out a practical method of coordinating the

research projects of our major universities. The Social Action Department of NCWC, ACTU, the Catholic Labor Alliance, and the National Catholic Rural Life Conference would undoubtedly be very happy to be of assistance to such a joint commission of these three organizations.

REV. GEORGE G. HIGGINS, ASST. DIRECTOR
Department of Social Action

National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C.

SOCIOLOGY IN THE MAJOR SEMINARY*

THE PROGRAM AT MT. ST. ALPHONSUS SEMINARY

JOSEPH L. KERINS, C.S.S.R., *Esopus, New York*

Throughout its history the Church has been ever solicitous about the training of aspirants to the priesthood. Numerous documents spell out in detail those elements which should constitute that training. A very large proportion of these official directives deal with the content of the education to be given future priests. In discussing the subject of the present panel it is imperative that we begin with the official directives bearing on our problem.

The Code of Canon Law devotes two separate canons to the content of the seminary curriculum — canon 589 for seminaries for religious institutes and canon 1365 for diocesan seminaries. In neither one is sociology or social science mentioned specifically. But other official sources leave no room for doubt that some formal and distinct training must be given in the general area of science with which this discussion is concerned. We can arrive at this conclusion from at least three separate approaches — only the last of which need detain us for any length of time. We have, first, an argument in the intrinsic importance and current imperative need of such knowledge on the part of priests. Second, we can argue from a certain general norm, most recently stated by Pope Pius XII in his Apostolic Exhortation, "Menti Nostrae," wherein he urges that "the literary and scientific education of future priests be at least not inferior to that of laymen who take similar courses of study."¹

But undoubtedly most pertinent here is the third source of argument — the direct statements of recent Popes on the matter. Even granted that we can argue only indirectly from the tenor of such documents as *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*, there would seem to be no doubt that without formal training priests will not be equipped to play the role the Church expects of them in modern society. Furthermore, we do have explicit

* Paper read at the Thirteenth Annual Convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

¹ *The Catholic Mind*, vol. 49, n. 1057 (Jan. 1951), p. 55.

statements urging such formal training. Pope Leo XIII in a letter to the Bishops of Italy in 1902 directed that candidates for the priesthood toward the end of their seminary course should be duly instructed in the papal documents which treat of the social question and Christian democracy.² In 1910 Pope Pius X recommended that in connection with the courses in moral theology, seminarians be trained also in the fundamental notions of sociology.³ Pope Benedict XV repeated this directive in 1920.⁴ We are all familiar with the passage toward the end of *Quadragesimo Anno* in which Pope Pius XI emphasizes that to fulfill his ministry in modern times the priest "must be duly prepared by an intensive study of the social question."⁵ In "Menti Nostrae" last year Pope Pius XII says: "In the intellectual training of young seminarians . . . studies . . . relating to social questions, so necessary today, should not be overlooked."⁶ I would here emphasize the following points by way of interpretation of, and conclusion from, these and similar statements:

1. In this formal training in social questions, undoubtedly major emphasis should be put upon *the* social question, upon the problem of capital and labor as treated in the labor encyclicals.

2. The family is also an area on which this formal training must concentrate.

3. Formal treatment must also be given to the subject of Catholic Action. In fact, in 1935 Pope Pius XI directed that "students of seminaries . . . should be taught this form of apostleship."⁷

4. If the seminary is to succeed in turning out social-minded priests, two approaches must be used:

1. A general orientation toward the social content of traditional courses — especially philosophy, dogmatic and moral theology, and ecclesiastical history. (The papal statements above specifically direct this orientation in moral theology). It is primarily by this orientation that seminary students should be prepared for their ministry in modern times.

² *Enchiridion clericorum* (Rome, 1938), p. 392.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 481.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 571.

⁵ *Quadragesimo anno*. NCWC ed., p. 52.

⁶ *The Catholic Mind*, vol. 49, no. 1057 (Jan. 1951), p. 56.

⁷ T. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1934), vol. 2, p. 61. See also p. 65.

2. Some specific course or courses in social problems and social action. In this formal training, if the general orientation is successful, only minor attention need be paid to social theory and principles. Among the aims of the specific course or courses should be:

1. To give the factual content of society in which the principles must operate — to give the picture which the principles would change.

2. To develop an awareness of the complexities of modern society, to forestall over-simplification in the application of principles.

3. To encourage favorable attitudes and to stimulate mental alertness aimed at an integrated grasp of the social content of subsequent courses in the major branches.

Father John Cronin, in discussing this phase of clerical education says: "The ideal course . . . would offer at the philosophy level six semester hours in economics and three in sociology, with emphasis in the latter course on social problems . . . Then at the theology level, preferably in the deacon year, there would be offered four semester hours divided between Catholic social principles and Catholic social action."⁸ Such generous conditions, of course, rarely prevail. Content problems under those circumstances would offer less difficulty. Under the less favorable circumstances which generally prevail, selection and adaptation are necessary. One need only page through the available catalogues of major seminaries throughout the United States to realize that local circumstances inevitably control the content of the course or courses specifically social. Where, for instance, introductory sociology and economics are given at the college level in the minor seminary, many of the "content problems" of the major seminary are forestalled. In other instances the schedules allot a generous proportion of class time to the course in social ethics and in such cases both principles and problems can be taught integrally. Some seminaries give the sociology course in the philosophy division; others, in theology; others yet spread it over both.

The history of the sociology course at Mt. St. Alphonsus can be summed up by saying that it has grown and it has dropped. It has grown in the class time allotted and it has dropped in its

⁸ John F. Cronin, *Catholic Social Action* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1948), p. 14.

location in the curriculum. From one hour a week in 4th theology, it was transferred to two hours a week in 2nd philosophy and is currently in the process of becoming three hours a week in 1st philosophy. Undoubtedly the major factor in these changes has been schedule pressure. But certain subsidiary advantages seemed to outweigh the disadvantages in the proposed present arrangement:

1. It offers a certain continuity in relationship with the social studies given in the college department of the minor seminary.

2. The first year of the major seminary seems to be a time psychologically opportune for the sharpening or the molding of suitable attitudes and values in the approach to modern social problems.

3. At the very beginning of the seminary training, the groundwork can be laid for making fruitful the general orientation already mentioned. Likewise, from the start interests may be guided toward participation in formal program and private study in the succeeding seminary years.

4. Pedagogically there seems to be some advantage in balancing this type of course against the first flights of the seminarians in the speculative sciences.

So the problem in our local circumstances comes down to this: what should be done with three hours per semester for the first two semesters of philosophy when this is the only time allotted specifically to sociology or allied disciplines in the six years of the major seminary?

Assuming the validity of the principles I have above elaborated and the success of the orientation program just described, the content of the course in outline is presented here.

* * *

SOCIOLOGY IN THE MAJOR SEMINARY

The program at Mt. St. Alphonsus Seminary

JOSEPH L. KERINS, C.Ss.R., *Esopus, New York*

I. BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION:

1. Directives of the Holy See:

- a) In general — stress upon role of priest in modern society.
- b) Specific directives on courses and contents — generally lacking, but some have been given.

2. Comment on practice of some American major seminaries:
 - a) Little uniformity.
 - b) Problem of integration with courses in social ethics and moral theology.
 - c) Contribution of minor seminary.

II. SOCIOLOGY IN THE CURRICULUM AT MT. ST. ALPHONSUS:

- a) Reasons for change of present location in philosophy curriculum.
- b) Present arrangement: 3 hrs. per week for first two semesters of philosophy.
- c) General principle guiding choice of content: "pragmatic" concept of sociology — emphasis on social problems and action integrated with other courses.
- d) Aim of course is sociological, not doctrinal commentary on encyclicals.

III. FORMAL COURSE CONTENT:

A. THE SOCIAL QUESTION:

1. *Rerum Novarum*.

- a) Nature and authority of encyclicals.
- b) Background of labor encyclicals.
 1. Industrial revolution; emergence of capitalism.
 2. Economic liberalism — tenets and effects.
 3. The Socialist protest.
 4. Origins and development of Catholic social movement.
- c) The answer of the encyclical to tenets of Socialism and economic liberalism and to certain disputes among Catholics (on unionism, role of the state, etc).

2. *Quadragesimo Anno*.

1. Relationship to *Rerum Novarum*.
2. Catholic social teaching in the U.S. — Bishops' statements, etc.
3. Catholic social action in the U.S. — NCWC, ACTU, labor schools, etc.
4. Survey of social legislation in the U.S.
5. History of the American labor movement.

6. Poverty in the U.S. — extent, living wage, social security, etc.
7. Industry council plan.
8. Changes in economic life since Leo XIII.
9. Changes in Socialism since Leo XIII.
10. Summary of *Divini Redemptoris*.

B. PROBLEMS IN MODERN FAMILY LIFE: *Castii Conubii*.

1. Modern American family — changing functions; social values, theories, conditions fostering instability.
2. Birth control — population problems and trends.
3. Abortion and sterilization.
4. Feminism — false emancipation of women, equal rights amendment, recent papal directives to women, etc.
5. Mixed marriages.
6. Divorce.
7. Catholic social remedial action — education for family life, Family Life Bureau, Cana Conference movement, family allowance procedure, etc.

C. CATHOLIC ACTION.

1. Origins and development of concept.
2. Principles and techniques.
3. Relationship to general Catholic social movement.

D. SELECTED SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

1. Racism — Negro problem.
2. Crime and juvenile delinquency.
3. Physical and mental health — health insurance problem.

IV. BY WAY OF CONCLUSION:

1. Extra-curricular aids — guest speakers, films, bulletin board, public discussions, library exhibits, etc.
2. Problem of maintaining interest and active study in later years of seminary.
3. Special questions for discussion:
 1. How can the "textbook problem" be solved in this type of course?
 2. Should an attempt be made to cover methods of research even to the neglect of certain social problems now discussed? How about post-course elective seminars on research methods?

3. Is the neglect of "parish sociology" a serious oversight? How can this be remedied?
4. What about the social conditions and problems of missionary areas?
5. What methods can be used to provide information and discussion about selected current problems and events?

* * *

MAJOR SOURCES OF MATERIAL FOR THE FORMAL COURSE:

Five Great Encyclicals. N.Y. Paulist Press, 1939.

Mihanovich & Schuyler. *Current Social Problems.* Bruce, 1950.

Cronin J. *Catholic Social Action.* Bruce, 1948.

Cronin, J. *Catholic Social Principles.* Bruce, 1950.

Miller, R. *Forty Years After.* Radio Replies Press, 1947.

Murray, R. *Introductory Sociology.* 2d ed., Crofts, 1946.

SOCIOLOGY IN THE MAJOR SEMINARY *

THE PROGRAM AT OUR LADY OF ANGELS SEMINARY

HERMAN DOERR, O.F.M., *Cleveland, Ohio*

'Tis with our judgments as our watches; none go
just alike, yet each believes his own. (*Pope*)

That very wise observation of the poet applies perfectly to a situation such as is to be found in a program of teaching sociology to seminarians. We all have a mentality preferentially attuned to a definite *general course* in seminary sociology and to a definite *method* of teaching that course. And this preference isn't something arbitrary, something small and selfish. No, it is based on good, solid judgments, backed up by years of experience. So, may I begin by making it clear that I don't want to "sell" my way of doing things. All I'd like to do is outline my program with the hope that it may indicate helpful emphasis, variation in the arrangement of material, or technique.

Before going into the program proper, it will be in place

* Paper read at the Thirteenth Annual Convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

to give you the stage-setting, as it were, in which this program is presented. Our house of studies is not a complete major seminary. It embraces only the study of philosophy and allied subjects. It is here, and here alone, that a course in sociology is taught to our seminarians. In the other departments of our seminary set-up there are the usual courses or subjects which have a sociological bearing only by implication and application. Thus, there are U.S. history and civics in the minor seminary; and in theology, pastoral theology, and a number of related treatises such as those on justice, charity, and the Mystical Body.

In our department we have three years of philosophy. Sociology is given in the third year, at the same time that ethics is being taught. To my mind this is very fortunate, for so much of sociology, if it is to be of service to priests in the ministry, is bound up with ethics. And if the two are run concurrently, the social questions often serve as practical examples for the ethical principles. This is particularly true where the same teacher handles both subjects, as in our seminary.

Our sociology course itself is a four-semester-hour affair. As a rule, it is taken twice a week in both semesters, but this year it is being given four times per week in one semester. This program, as a glance at the summary will reveal, has two major divisions, *curricular* and *extracurricular*, each with four different activities. Let us consider them individually.

THE CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

ATTITUDE BUILDER. First, under this heading, comes what I call the Attitude Builder. In the first class of the year, the students are given a talk on sociology in the seminary. This includes a brief history of the question, the objectives of such a course, the set-up in our own seminary, and the importance of this study. Special effort is made to leave the impression with the students that this course can mean a great deal to them in their priesthood later on. And to give this idea a chance to sink in and take firm root, a copy of the book *The Priest and Social Action* is handed to each student. A number of chapters are assigned, chapters like "Religion and Social Action," "The Place of the Priest in Social Action," "Social Study in Seminaries," etc. Although the book is of rather ancient vintage (1914 ed.), still I believe it has lost none of its value so far as the specially selected chapters are concerned. Moreover, Father

Plater writes with an unction and enthusiasm that are contagious. Hence, the book serves as a first-rate pep talk to the students, and they are more in earnest, more eager, regarding the study of sociology for having read it.

OUTLINE OF SOCIOLOGY. Next, there is the Outline of Sociology. This is divided into six parts, namely Setting (geographical factors), People, Culture, Social Actions, Aids to social living, and Results of social living (normal and abnormal or problems). To get some idea of what is contained in these various parts, let me briefly list the contents of each. Under "Setting" we consider the farmstead (rural life), hamlets, towns, and villages (rurban life), city (urban life, neighborhood, community, metropolitan area), region, nation, and world. These geographical divisions are studied briefly from five angles: territory, population, relations and interactions, problems, and planning. Under "People" we include the individual (heredity and environment), inchoate groupings (crowds, public), social groups, social classes, race, demography, and eugenics. "Culture" deals, of course, with just that — culture, its nature, elements (culture trait, complex, pattern, etc.), contents (folkways, mores, institutions), origin, and principal early culture ages. The part on "Social Actions" is concerned with the nature of social processes and their principal types (competition, conflict, stratification, co-operation, assimilation, socialization, social movements). "Aids to Social Living" comprise communication, transportation, social control, and planning.

In addition to these six parts, there is a sort of introductory note and concluding note. In the former the nature of sociology itself is analyzed and compared to the other social sciences. In the latter, the concluding note, a quick survey of social theory is attempted. The special "schools" or special interests of social theory are linked up, as far as possible, with one of the parts of the Outline. Thus, with "Setting" (geographical factors) mention is made of the geographical school and ecological school. With "People" go the bio-organismic, racial, sociologicistic, demographic, and psychological schools. And so with the other parts.

The reasons why I like this outline method of teaching sociology are: 1) The teacher can make it as long or as short as may be necessary. It usually takes us three full months or about 24 classes to cover the Outline. Should I find myself pressed for time, however, I could very easily cut down on the number of

classes needed. 2) It gives the student a sweeping bird's-eye view of the whole field of sociology in one glance, as it were. By that I mean, in a short time the student has a look at the complete skeletal form of sociology — its content, its terminology, its varying areas of emphasis. 3) The third advantage, as I see it, is closely connected with the preceding. The student is not confused or led off the track by pages of examinations, examples, charts, pictures, etc. His first contact with sociology is a clear-cut and exclusive view of its basic subject matter and terminology, for they are the only things on the page before him.

This last advantage, however, is also the weakness of the Outline. It is definitely only an outline, and the student must be introduced to something more complete, more detailed, more helpful. That is why the summary has the notation about Father Murray's *Introductory Sociology*. In addition to the Outline, explained above, the students are expected to know the main points of this textbook. As you know, the book contains eight parts. Each month — from September to April included — the students must go through one of these parts and be ready to give an account of it. We do not consider the book in class. The students are responsible on their own for studying it. They may, however, always bring up points they do not understand, and these are explained during class.

Father Murray's book, besides filling in the Outline very adequately, has another advantage. It exposes the student for the second time to the basic subject matter and terminology of sociology, which he met once before in the Outline. Due to this double exposure, it is hoped that the resulting learning process may set a little more permanently than usual.

In passing, I might mention that this year we are going to use Father Murray's new book, *Sociology and a Democratic Society*, as the companion text of the Outline.

THREE SPECIAL FIELDS. When we have completed our study of the Outline, which is usually about the beginning of December, we turn to something more specific, we "specialize." It seemed to me that the three fields of *family*, *government*, and *industry* were perhaps the best choices for this more detailed study. They certainly are fundamental in the lives of men, hence, no doubt are the fields wherein are met most of the problems calling for priestly charity, and wherein priestly influence can most profitably be expended.

For these three fields mimeographed notes are used. There is nothing original about them. They are simply a collection of principles, observations, and suggestions from various sources. But in the mimeographed version, these items are all together; they are arranged as seems most helpful; and the emphasis is laid where it will be most effective.

The treatise on the family usually runs from the beginning of December until the mid-year examinations. That on government goes from around the beginning of February till the middle of March. The rest of the year's classes are for the study of occupational society. The items listed in the summary under each respective field give sufficient indication of what is treated and the extent of that treatment.

In conjunction with each special field there are a number of papal encyclicals. There is no fixed technique for studying these encyclicals. Sometimes the students outline them. Again they may have to pick out the main principles. Or, finally, they will be asked at times to recast them in the so-called "easy-essay" style. I have found none of these methods significantly preferable from the point of getting a deeper knowledge of the encyclicals. A slight edge might be conceded to the "easy-essay" recasting. But the main reason why these different methods are used is merely variety.

The "Nota Bene" is, I believe, self-explanatory. There are many serviceable pamphlets related to these three fields, especially those of the N.C.W.C. and of the Paulist Press. The current pronouncements of our present Holy Father are taken either from Catholic papers or from the *Catholic Mind*. As a rule, the pamphlets and the papal pronouncements are not required class material. They are simply put on display in the classroom, and the students are urged to read them or at least to become acquainted with them by paging through them.

Book Reviews. The final curricular activity is Book Reviews. As noted, these are had in the second semester. It is felt that the students, by that time, will have acquired both interest in, and knowledge of, social matters to be able to do a good job on these Book Reviews.

The summary states that the Reviews are supplementary to the course itself. Due to shortage of time, many points in sociology cannot be taken in the regular class material. And lest the students miss out entirely on these points, an effort is made to

give them some information about them by means of the Book Reviews. That is why their selection is made by the teacher and not left to the choice of the students. The list of books reviewed differs somewhat each year, but usually includes such titles as juvenile delinquency, co-operatives, social message of Jesus and of the early Church Fathers, the race question, some outstanding sociologist or social worker, the Taft-Hartley law, and at least one on social philosophy.

The method of presenting these Book Reviews is indicated with sufficient detail in the summary. The discussion period is always a very spirited affair, which leads me to hope that the Book Reviews do fill a definite need and fill it somewhat adequately. At least they seem to arouse interest in the students on the particular subject under discussion, and often lead them to study more deeply on their own initiative.

THE EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

CURRENT AFFAIRS. These extracurricular activities are much the same in every seminary and, hence, I doubt whether my remarks will afford any new information on the subject. The first, Current Affairs, is listed under extracurricular activities because our course is interested more in principles than in current events. Consequently, the means for keeping abreast of current affairs are made available to the students, but very little class time is devoted to such topics, except now and then a few words of advice about interpreting them, or a brief check-up to see if the students are using the means at their disposal.

The labor papers used are *Labor*, *Work*, and *The Wage Earner*. The magazine is *U.S. News and World Report*. From the papers the students get Labor's slant on things, and from the magazine they see Management's side of the picture. In this way it is possible to arrive at a balanced judgment on matters that affect both parties. The news map is the standard one from the *News Map of the Week, Inc.* (1512 Orleans Street, Chicago, Illinois). Its special value lies in this, that it gives the highlights of the week's news *plus* a map of the world on which are spotted the location of these happenings. Moreover, each issue of the news map features one or more particular social questions or events, giving their history, growth, comparative importance in various times and countries, etc. The bulletin board is in

the classroom, and is used especially for items of social interest from the secular newspapers.

STUDY CLUBS AND PANEL DISCUSSIONS. Second, we encourage Study Clubs and Panel Discussions. They are, however, entirely voluntary. Almost every year there is a Study Club concerned with the race question and with Communism. And, with a little coaching, the students readily become interested in similar social topics. While the number actually *working* in the Study Club is small, e.g., five or six, the meetings are open to *all* the students, and are rather well attended. At times, too, a Panel Discussion will be had for the entire seminary — priests, students, and lay brothers. The last one of these, on Communism, was a first-class piece of work and had everybody in the seminary discussing Communism for awhile.

GUEST SPEAKERS. With regard to Guest Speakers, there is no fixed schedule, say one every couple of weeks or one every month. Rather, their appearance before the student body is more or less fortuitous. For instance, a friend tells us about a good speaker and asks whether we would like to have him address the seminarians, or a visiting priest gives them a talk. In this way we have, on the average, at least ten or twelve outside speakers every year. In the first class following such a speech, we make it a point to go through the speech again, and thus try to obtain as much value as possible from it.

FIELD TRIPS. Finally, there are Field Trips. Some of these are regular affairs to definite institutions where the students go at stated times to sing. While they are there, the chaplain of the institution takes them around and explains the interesting features and social implications. These institutions are the County Infirmary, the County Workhouse, and the house of Little Sisters of the Poor. Other trips are made, as the opportunity to do so presents itself, to these and similar institutions: the diocesan orphanage (cottage style orphanage), the juvenile court, the central police station, the central firemen's station, and the city hospital. As with guest speakers, so here, too, we always have a class discussion following a visit to one of the above institutions.

This, then, is a quick review of my way of teaching sociology to seminarians. Maybe "sociology" isn't the name for the course. Frankly, it is not so much a course of *simon-pure* sociology, as

rather what might be styled a "mixed" course, i.e., a course embodying principles taken from all the social sciences that can be of service to the future priest in his social contacts. He is not going to be a social surveyor or a research specialist or a professional sociologist later on, but a social helper, physician, and reformer. And that is why, as stated above, principles are stressed more than facts and conditions. Principles are of lasting value while events and conditions change by the day, hour, and minute.

This course is offered to the seminarians with two objectives in mind (there is no question of the *ultimate* objective here, but only of those more proximate), namely to fill them with enthusiasm, and to give them the knowledge requisite to use that enthusiasm profitably.

If the seminarians can be made to realize how very important social conditions are in the lives of people; how a very large percentage of the problems they, as future priests, will have to cope with will be social in nature; how social conditions are really the setting for spiritual operations, and often set the limits to the effectiveness of such operations; I say, if the seminarians can be brought to a realization of these truths, they will certainly become interested in social questions and the Church's social program.

And once they are interested, they must be given a good, solid, basic instruction in social principles and techniques so that they are capable of canalizing their enthusiasm for the surest and greatest profit to all concerned, and not permit it to run wild.

In a word, the seminarians must be helped to become willing and capable shepherds of Christ's flock. If they are interested, they will be willing. If they are well instructed, they will be capable.

Are these objectives being attained? All I know is that the *interest* developed in our department is carrying over, to some extent, into the theology department. For the students there have asked authorities to subscribe to a number of labor papers and to the magazine *U.S. News and World Report*. As to the *capability* of the priests who have taken this sociology course, I cannot give any appraisal as yet because only this year has the first class of such students left the seminary.

NEWS OF SOCIOLOGICAL INTEREST

The Thirteenth Annual Convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society was held at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., from December 28 to 30, 1951. The program was well received and comments indicate that the convention was a success.

The Executive Council wishes to thank all who gave so generously of their time and work to present the program.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE ACSS

Credit balance 12/27/50	\$297.58
Income from dues and subscriptions	2,674.10
	\$2,971.68
Expenditures: Printing, four editions	\$1,067.60
Office supplies and expense	373.76
Miscellaneous	46.59
	\$1,487.95
Credit balance 12/20/51	\$1,483.73

MEMBERSHIP REPORT OF THE ACSS

	December, 1950	December, 1951
Constituent members	270	269
Student members	36	17
Institutional members	49	42

In December, 1950, there were 218 subscribers to the *REVIEW* as compared with 226 subscribers in December, 1951.

Chicago, Illinois. February 28 marked the opening session of the fourth annual John A. Ryan Forum, a discussion series sponsored by the Catholic Labor Alliance, at the Morrison Hotel. The first panel discussion was devoted to world peace. The second, scheduled for March 28, will deal with inflation. The third and final panel will meet on May 15, at which time the topic will be "Bridging the Gap Between Labor and Management." Tickets and further information are available from the Catholic Labor Alliance, 21 West Superior Street, Chicago.

Sister M. Inez Hilger, O.S.B., St. Cloud Hospital School of Nursing, St. Cloud, Minnesota, and Margaret Mondloch, as Field Assistant, are making an ethnological study of child life among the Araucanian Indians of Argentina (1951-1952) under grants from the American Philosophical Society and the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. Sister Inez' study entitled "Chippewa Child Life and Its Cultural Background" will appear as *Bulletin* 146 of the Bureau of American Ethnology,

Smithsonian Institution, and her Arapaho study as *Bulletin* 148. Her study of Araucanian Indian child life of Chile is ready for the publishers.

College of Steubenville. The Court of Last Resort, a national organization working in the interest of justice in our courts, was awarded the Poverello Medal, the highest non-academic honor of the College of Steubenville, at the college's annual Founders' Day Banquet held at the Steubenville Country Club on December 9. The Poverello Medal Award was established in 1949 by the college, and each year is given to a person or organization which, through its benefactions, exemplifies the spirit of Christ-like charity which filled the life of Saint Francis of Assisi, the Patron Saint of the College. Previous recipients of the medal were the Alcoholic Anonymous Fellowship and Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pennsylvania.

The College of Steubenville was established in 1946 and is conducted by the Franciscan Fathers of the Third Order.

New York, New York. James O'Gara, formerly a member of the Department of Sociology at Loyola University in Chicago, has joined the staff of *Commonweal* magazine. He will serve as managing editor of the publication.

Des Moines, Iowa. The National Catholic Rural Life Conference held its 29th annual convention in Boston recently. At the sessions for the Board of Directors, resolutions were passed endorsing: 1) family farms, 2) the Department of Agriculture's family farm policy, 3) democratic cooperatives, 4) several programs for foreign land reform, together with technical and economic aid, 5) international migration to aid areas of underdevelopment, 6) the conclusions of the first international Catholic congress on problems of rural life (held at Castel Gondolfo, June 25-July 1, 1951).

Diocesan directors passed two resolutions. The first deals with special training for the rural apostolate; the second urges rural pastors and educators to stress the moral duties of proper use and conservation of natural resources.

Copies of both series of resolutions may be obtained without charge by writing the N.C.R.L.C., 3801 Grand Avenue, Des Moines 12, Iowa. A pamphlet, *Christianity and the Land*, summarizing the results of the Castel Gondolfo meeting is also available at twenty-five cents a copy, 10 for \$2, 100 for \$15.

St. Louis, Missouri. Frederick P. Kenkel, long a member of the ACSS, died recently at the age of 89. He was organizer and director of the Central bureau of the Central Verein of America since 1909. Recipient of the Laetare Medal in 1930, he was also made a Knight of St. Gregory by Pius XI. His writings in the field of Catholic social action brought him international recognition. He was director of the Catholic Rural Life Conference, vice president of the Catholic Association for International Peace, president of the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems.

The Catholic University of America. A seminar on the teaching of sociology will be conducted by C. J. Nuesse as a part of the Workshop on Theology, Philosophy, and History as integrating disciplines in the Catholic College, June 13-24, 1952. Further information may be obtained by writing to Dr. Roy J. Deferrari, Director of University Workshops, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D.C.

Two members of the Society will have articles on marriage in the June issue of the *Voice of St. Jude*. Father Ralph A. Gallagher, S.J., and Dr. Clement S. Mihanovich have contributed articles to the special issue of this national Catholic monthly, which is devoting its June issue to the subject of marriage and the family. The Managing Editor of the *Voice of St. Jude* is Donald J. Thorman, a member of the Editorial Board of the REVIEW. Extra copies of this special issue will be available to schools and individuals. Write for bulk rates before May 1st to: Circulation Department, *Voice of St. Jude*, 221 West Madison Street, Chicago 6, Illinois.

Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois. In response to those who have inquired why the recent discoveries of ancient men in Iran were not discussed in his article, "The Problem of Man's Physical Origins," which appeared in the December, 1951 issue of the *ACSR*, the Rev. S. A. Sieber, S.V.D., has sent the following communication:

In 1951 a number of popular magazines published some sensational stories concerning the human remains discovered by Prof. Carleton S. Coon and his associates in a cave on the south shore of the Caspian Sea in Iran. This skeletal material is now referred to as *Hotu Man*. These sensational reports described *Hotu Man* as a modern-looking type that lived 75,000 years ago!

Nowhere could a person find a better case to exemplify the need for caution recommended in the above-mentioned article (Cf. p. 220). A brief résumé of the facts in the *Hotu* find will demonstrate this.

The find consisted of three complete skeletons and a few odd bones. They were found in the fourth gravel level thirty feet below the floor of the cave. Whenever the Caspian Sea is at normal level this cave is flooded with water. The burial is not a natural one, i.e., the bones and culture materials were not found *in situ*. It is possible that the association is entirely accidental.

Hotu Man is definitely of the modern *Homo Sapiens* type. Particularly Skull No. 2 looks like a modern individual. Even though it is slightly ill-filled the skull is perfectly modern. The cranial capacity is large, in the neighborhood of 1425 cc. The skull resembles very much the Upper Paleolithic people of Europe with a flat Cro-Magnon face.

It is very interesting to note that the three skeletons show much heterogeneity. This is remarkable for a small population. Perhaps it is a case of genetic drift. The restricted skull seems to be related to the desert type and for this reason *Hotu Man* may well be ancestral to the modern Iranian population which also manifests a desert zone body build.

Hotu Man was tall and well nourished with a body specialized for great bodily activity. The one female is powerfully built. The hands of Skeleton No. 3 show signs of great activity of the thumb and little finger. The sacrum also indicates a hard life with great stress repeatedly endured between the fifth sacral and the first lumbar vertebrae. The rugged female in the group also has a very large head on the femur which also indicates much hard work. However, the other female is quite delicately built. The skeletons have been given the ages 40 years for No. 1, 29 for No. 2, 37 for No. 3.

How long ago did *Hotu Man* live? (Remember that *Life* and *Time* magazines dated *Hotu Man* at a time 75,000 years ago!) What are the facts? *Geological* data point to the latter part of the Wurm glaciation. The *Cultural* material is from the third stage of Aurignacian, i.e., Gravettian. As Father Raymond Murray correctly states, Aurignacian Man left western Europe 12,000 B.C. (Cf. *Man's Unknown Ancestors*, p. 154). At the recent meeting of the AAAS, section H, at the Hotel Bellevue-Stratford in Philadelphia Dr. Lauriston Ward suggested dating *Hotu Man* at 10 to 12,000 years ago. And Dr. J. L. Angel, who processed the skeletal material, agreed with him. Now 12,000 is quite a come-down from the sensational 75,000. Thus *Hotu Man* is not an ancient modern at all but lived comparatively recently. That he should look like modern *Homo Sapiens* is perfectly understandable, for modern-looking *Homo Sapiens* has been around here at least 25,000 years.

My failure to include *Hotu Man* in the discussion was perfectly justified since his case presents no problem. This and other such "sensational" cases should warn us against too hasty decisions in these matters.

In my article I also urged caution in the acceptance of the recent find at Fontéchevade in France. Some were disturbed that I was unwilling to go along with Vallois in classifying Fontéchevade as an ancient modern. Although the stratigraphic evidence in the case of this find could hardly be gainsaid and therefore its *date* can be accepted without misgivings, there is still a question of its morphological modernity. Vallois himself admits that the absence of the frontal torus is an anatomical problem subject to various interpretations. I can only repeat the dictum laid down in the December article (p. 227) "when dealing with unknown quantities extrapolation is a very hazardous procedure." The missing bone you reconstructed along "expected lines" might just turn up some day and prove your "intuitional insight" to be nothing else but a poor guess.

It might not be out of place to add that years ago it was patriotic for an English anthropologist to defend Swanscombe as the "first Englishman" and the Germans to plug for Steinheim as the "first German." Maybe Vallois is getting into the act as a good and loyal Frenchman and his praise of Fontéchevade is nothing but a patriotic gesture.

BOOK REVIEWS

BROTHER GERALD J. SCHNEPP, S.M., *Editor*
ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS 3, MO.

The Sociology of the Parish. Edited by C. J. Nuesse and Thomas J. Harte, C.Ss.R. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1950. Pp. x+354. \$4.50.

The subtitle of this book is "An Introductory Symposium," and it is thus well described. It is not too much to say that this publication constitutes a primer in parish sociology. All students eager to study the sociology of the parish will want to examine this book for basic information on the parish, its origin and development, its structure, suggested methodology and for possible research areas. All chapters are not strictly sociological and in view of the book's purposes perhaps should not be. Father Hannan's chapter, "The Development of the Form of the Modern Parish" affords a concise but thorough history of the parish form of organization. Father Harte provides an excellent but perhaps too abbreviated discussion of ethnic and racial parishes. This reader, at least, would have preferred a somewhat more detailed analysis but the author admits his limitations due to lack of space. Father MacDonald's section on "Trusteeism" is unusually well done and this reviewer knows of no superior treatment in terms of available space.

Two chapters appear to be outstanding from a sociological viewpoint: Dr. Donovan's, "The Social Structure of the Parish" and Dr. Nuesse's, "Empirical Problems for Social Research in the Parish." The former has utilized some of the work done by industrial sociologists on the informal group for an analysis of such groupings in parishes. This section may amaze some pastors and curates even though they must be vaguely aware of these facts. Professor Nuesse has spelled out both the function of the professional sociologist in examining parish sociology and types of research that may be undertaken. Father Furfey has raised some important issues about social classes in a parish but perhaps has not quite amplified his meaning of social class sufficiently for the readers who are not sociologists. It will be a misfortune if such readers idly brush off the vital implications of this author because they do not understand or fully accept his definition of social class. Father Kelly and Brother Gerald Schnepf have provided sections on methods of the parish census and survey, both of which are extremely helpful.

In view of the current controversy over parish sociology, the publication of this book is most timely. In an excellent foreword Cardinal Stritch has written: "The purpose and the end

of all sociological studies is the betterment of society" (page ix). This book provides the background and basic techniques for sociological analyses of the parish; Cardinal Stritch's statement should provide the motivation. Such a fortuitous combination, it is hoped, will revive the interest and stimulate the efforts of those who may now be hesitating to engage in this most important area of sociological investigation.

JOHN J. KANE

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.

Communism Versus the Negro. By William A. Nolan. Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1951. Pp. ix+276. \$3.50.

In the first sentence of the preface, the author delimits his study to one area of communist propaganda in the United States. Thus he claims only to describe the communist attempt to exploit the miseries and misfortunes of "America's most unjustly treated minority, the Negro people."

Father Nolan, who studied at Fordham for the doctorate in political sociology, has extensively documented American communist trends and techniques, strategies and tactics in the attempt to win the Negro. His pages show wide research in official literature, as well as in the leading Negro magazines and newspapers. Interviews with some five hundred persons (college presidents, ministers, writers, cotton pickers, students, ex-communists and many other types all through the United States) supplement the results of research.

Certain activities and objectives of the Communist International and of the Soviet Union illuminate the course of communist activities among American Negroes. Therefore the historical and ideological foundation is first in presentation here. Then the author takes up the two chief slogans used in the American campaign to foster dissension and destruction ("self-determination" and "equal rights") and treats them in the light of the varying Moscow party line.

The author has accomplished his proposed objective. His wealth of evidence proves that the deceit of the communist line was apparent to the majority of Negro leaders since 1919, when the campaign began. Negroes like Mrs. Edith Sampson, Jackie Robinson, Dr. Charles John of Fisk and Dr. Ralph Bunche are too intelligent and discerning to be snared by counterfeit promises. Yet the very seriousness of the communist attempts, though they ended in failure generally, should stimulate and encourage those who want to see opportunity and democracy extended to the United States' "second-class citizens."

RAYMOND BERNARD, S.J.

Institute of Social Order, St. Louis 8, Mo.

Intelligence and Cultural Differences: A Study of Cultural Learning and Problem-solving. By Kenneth Eells, Allison Davis, Robert J. Havighurst, Virgil E. Herrick, and Ralph W. Tyler. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951. Pp. xii+388. \$5.00.

Three groups of readers will find this volume of unusual interest. The analysis of environment factors related to measurable differences in mental status among children will prove valuable to the social psychologists, the careful and extensive evaluation of responses to several types of questions and problems on intelligence tests is a fruitful contribution to the field of education, and the clarity and precision of the presentation of methodology should place the book on the required reading list of every student of social science who has grasped the fundamentals of statistical research.

This is the first book-length report of part of an extensive study of cultural learning as it bears on the solution of problems in mental tests which started in 1945 and was conducted under the sponsorship of an interdepartmental committee at the University of Chicago. Rockford, Illinois, is the locale for the study, and some 4,500 children in the public and parochial school system supplied the responses for the analysis of nine widely used group intelligence tests.

Probably the greatest contribution to factual knowledge is the variation in the responses of children of different socio-economic backgrounds to the different types of items on the several tests. A modification of Warner's Index of Status Characteristics was used to classify pupils into cultural groups and Rockford was chosen partly because the cultural groups seemed to be more clearly discernible. There may be room for differences of opinion on definitions of terms such as intelligence, or what intelligence tests are supposed to measure, but the position of the authors and the analysis thereon is clearly presented.

In the analysis of factors that bear a relationship to differences in responses to selected items in the tests, it would seem that such factors as rank in the family, and the role of values might be more thoroughly explored. These and other factors could assume importance, but their inclusion or omission would bring up the question of the real significance of evidence based on the analysis of multiple subdivisions of any given survey population.

If there are difficulties they are more than offset by the careful step-by-step presentation, the description of methodology, the scope of analysis, the wealth of evaluation, the excellent bibliography. The book might well serve as a model of social science research.

JOSEPH W. MCGEE

Marquette University, Milwaukee 3, Wis.

Moral Problems in Social Work. By Charles R. McKenney, S.J. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1951. Pp xv+131. \$2.50.

This is the first text of its kind discussing the moral problems in social work from a Catholic point of view. Father McKenney was well prepared for this task by his education in professional social work at the Fordham University School of Social Service as well as by his background in ethics and moral theology. Since the principles of natural law apply in all situations, the text has unusual value for non-Catholic as well as Catholic social workers. There is a constant searching for principles clearly defined which govern human actions in the field of social work practice. It is probable that irrespective of their particular faith many social workers will welcome this volume as a guide. In Catholic schools of social work it can serve very well as a textbook.

After discussing the criteria and bases of morality and the principles of the natural and positive laws, the author takes up chapter by chapter the most common and the more difficult situations that confront the social worker in practice. He explains the principle of double effect, the meaning of cooperation, the formation of conscience as one's proximate guide. Then there are chapters on the entrusted secret, the immorality of sterilization, euthanasia, abortion, and birth control. The application of these principles to case situations is made and will prove helpful. It is difficult, however, to incorporate both the principles of morality and their application in one text except by way of illustration. In actual practice social workers know that each case has its peculiar variations. It might well be that a text of cases would serve a good purpose as a complement to Father McKenney's volume. There is a bibliography at the beginning of the book, but it is difficult to determine what the criteria for selection of references was.

A. H. SCHELLER, S.J.

Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Mo.

Types of Religious Experience, Christian and Non-Christian. By Joachim Wach. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951. Pp. xvi+275. \$3.50.

"We have outgrown historicism and relativism," declares the author of this work (p. 229), after making and, for the most part, keeping a careful distinction between theology and the "general science of religion . . . concerned with phenomenological, historical, psychological and sociological examination of all religions" (p. xiv). The non-specialist will find the first three chapters, in which the distinctions and relations of these fields are treated in general terms, of major interest as a complement to Professor Wach's earlier study, *Sociology of Religion*. The concepts developed in this first part of the book are

applied in the second part to the Near Eastern religions, Islam, and Mahayana Buddhism, and in the third part to considerations of the thought of Caspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig, a little known Reformer, Alexis de Tocqueville, whose practical Catholicity is here defended, and Rudolf Otto, author of *The Idea of the Holy*, to whom the author acknowledges his personal debt.

As the title suggests, much use is made of the typological method. This is not a unified systematic work, however, but a collection of essays originally published in journals. In the first essay, devoted to the relation of the history of religion to the study of theology, particular attention is given to various theological positions on the study of non-Christian religions. Catholic tradition is shown to have found positive values in alien thought, since it used from an early date Greek philosophy and the Stoic notion of the *logos spermatikos* (the scattered germ of truth), and later developed the concept of a natural theology. No mention is made, however, of Catholic teaching on a primitive revelation, which would also provide a ground for the type of study under consideration. An attempt to state "universals in religion" is found in the second chapter. The first of these is found in the universality of religious experience itself, defined as "the total response of the total being to what he experiences as ultimate reality" (p. 35). It is also proposed that this experience tends universally toward expression, and that other universals may be found in the types of motives and the interrelated modes of expression — intellectual, practical, and sociological — as well as in the "situational conditions." Of particular interest for the development of typological classifications is the ninth chapter, entitled "Church, Denomination and Sect."

While the author's doctrinal position or other opinions seem to influence his historical or sociological treatment in a few places, the fruitfulness of the method employed in this book is well established.

C. J. NUESSE

The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

The Forgotten Language. An Introduction to the Understanding of Dreams, Fairy Tales and Myths. By Erich Fromm. New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc., 1951. Pp. VII+263. \$3.50 (Text: \$2.50).

There is probably no better introduction to Freudian psychology and the very significant development which it has undergone in the past ten years — largely under the influence of sociology — than this book even though its main purpose is to concentrate on a study of dreams. It also becomes obvious that modern psychology in the form given it mainly by the Washington School of Psychiatry (Harry Stack Sullivan and many others, including our author himself) is much more acceptable to Catholics. But the principal reason for turning the attention

of sociologists to *The Forgotten Language* lies in just that part of it which justifies this title.

Fromm succeeds very well in his attempt to show that "symbolic language is a language in its own right; in fact, the only universal language the human race ever developed." There are universal symbols understandable to everyone provided he applies himself to "learning" them. The language which these symbols as "words" is a form of communication that cannot be neglected in any study of interpersonal and intergroup relations. It is also "important for every person who wants to be in touch with himself." Thus we may even be entitled to call the symbolic language the basic communication channel on which are founded all the others we study in the science of communication.

Symbolic language is a language in which inner experiences, feelings and thoughts are expressed as if they were sensory experiences, events in the outer world. It is a language which has a different logic from the conventional one we speak in the daytime, a logic in which not time and space are the ruling categories, but intensity and association. It is a language with its own grammar and syntax, as it were, a language one must understand if one is to understand the meaning of myths, fairy tales and dreams. Yet this language has been forgotten by modern man. Not when he is asleep, but when he is awake (p. 7).

Dreaming, according to Fromm, is "a meaningful and significant expression of any kind of mental activity under the condition of sleep." Dreams partake of our irrational and of our rational nature. Through dream interpretation therefore we understand "when our better self and when our animal nature makes itself heard in the dream." This concept of dream language is much broader than that developed by Freud. Fromm gives a very instructive survey of the history of dream interpretation, including quotations from Thomas Aquinas, showing how much the ancients already knew about the true nature of sleep and dreaming.

Examples of concrete dream interpretation and a highly stimulating analysis of several fairy tales and myths illustrate the author's theory and make it convincing to such a degree that the reader is willing to accept Fromm's contention that "symbolic language is the one foreign language that each of us must learn."

RUDOLPH E. MORRIS

Marquette University, Milwaukee 3, Wis.

English Life and Leisure. By B. Seeböhm Rowntree and G. R. Lavers. New York: Longmans Green & Co., 1951. Pp. xvi+482. \$4.00.

The ambitious program of the authors of this study was effected by 975 interviews with persons living in various cities,

towns, and rural districts of England and Wales, who were unaware that their life habits were under scrutiny. Two hundred and twenty of these interviews, made by G. R. Lavers and his assistants, are recorded in the first 121 pages of the book. The next 150 pages are devoted to an analysis of these under the topics of commercialized gambling, alcoholism, smoking, sexual promiscuity, movie and theater attendance, dancing, reading, educational activities, and religion. The final 100 pages consist of a somewhat detailed account of the facilities provided for leisure, and the use made of them by the 40,000 inhabitants of the representative English city of High Wycomb, and by the people in the Scandinavian countries. (Rowntree made the Scandinavian countries. (Rowntree made the Scandinavian study to indicate practices which the British might imitate).

The book does not make cheerful reading, and although it has genuine value for social scientists, its method is not always strictly scientific. In the accounts of interviews, comments on the unprepossessing appearance of one or two women are hardly orthodox scientifically; the later chapters not only include many ethical comments on the leisure time, pursuits and personal habits of the interviewees, but they also give the authors' ideas on the practical measures they propose for the improvement of English life and leisure.

EVA J. ROSS

Trinity College, Washington 17, D. C.

Society and Thought in Early America. By Harvey Wish. New York: Longmans Green and Co., 1950. Pp. xii+612. \$6.00, (Text: \$4.75).

As expressed by Author Wish, a chief aim and problem of the social historian is the integration of the complex strands of institutional and intellectual history. Here he is concerned with the extent to which cultural interaction between America and Europe resulted in distinctive American institutions and ideas. The sociologist, familiar with the obstacles to attaining similar aims in his contemporary observations, will question the reliability that can be accorded to conclusions based on data for which no representativeness can be assured and which were subject to selective forces beyond the social historian's control or powers of measurement.

Nevertheless, we have a highly readable and detailed survey of the life and times of early America with a sound regard for dominant thought-currents to give proper setting and perspective to events. Chapter titles (Examples: "The New England of Roger Williams;" "Cult of the Common Man: Horace Greeley's Era") might mislead one to expect an over-reliance upon the "dominant" or "typical" personality type of approach. Actually, these designations serve more as a device to organize the material with most satisfactory results. The chapters dealing with

the Civil War period are especially noteworthy in their recognition of a complex of social forces that contributed to what may be regarded as America's first real social revolution. One item of interest is what Wish terms an "incidental relationship" between the emergence of sociology in this country and the intellectual defense of the Lost Cause of slavery.

GORDON C. ZAHN

The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

American Sociology. By Howard W. Odum. New York: Longmans Green & Co., 1951. Pp. vi+501. \$5.00.

Professor Odum set himself the task to tell "the story of sociology in the United States through 1950." He divided his work into five parts. First, a brief history of antecedents in Europe and America. Following this, the most important section: ten chapters, each of which takes up in turn the 40 sociologists who have been presidents of the American Sociological Society since its formation in 1906. Biographical details for each of these presidents is given, complete lists of their works, and some information about their theories and methods, although this is by no means uniform in completeness and critical value. There are photographs of each of these presidents, plus fifteen others who are or have been editors of sociological journals, among the latter Rev. Ralph Gallagher, S.J., our *ACSR* editor. Extracts from writings and from presidential addresses not available elsewhere are to be found in this section. These past presidents who were still living were asked to talk about themselves and to evaluate their work, and they do so with varying degrees of objectivity and modesty. The questions from their replies will be especially interesting to students whose instructor is not already acquainted with personal anecdotes about these "big names," for such information often gives meaning to the ideas and approaches of an author. From these quotations, or from Odum's remarks, those who did not already know such details as why Faris wrote so little, how Fairchild came to be interested in sociology, or that Burgess did the lion's share of the joint Park and Burgess publications, will find such facts of value. Any young and/or naive student will probably be a little shocked at some of the self-evaluations, and a little of the glamor attached to this or that sociologist will be rubbed off forever, once he has read an assertion such as one author makes about himself: "I claim that the problem of social evolution is solved and that I have played a considerable part in solving it" (p. 151). Older sociologists will chuckle a little at some such statements.

Although Odum has shown considerable originality in tackling his gigantic task by means of presidential nominees, it is obvious that such a confining framework has its flaws. Now that trained sociologists can be numbered in hundreds, some important names are necessarily missing, especially of those who

have developed within the last fifteen years, and also some who have been influential for twenty years or more. Already two more presidents are to be noted: Robert Cooley Angell (1951) and the first woman president, Dorothy Swaine Thomas (1952). Women necessarily come off badly: the work of Mrs. Thomas, Mrs. Irene Taeuber, Mrs. Mira Kommorovsky, Mrs. Margaret Hagood and a number of other women sociologists, and an even greater number of male sociologists does not have the appraisal in the development of the science which it deserves and which students as well as sociologists abroad, need for an accurate knowledge of sociology here. Some of our best sociologists are not in strictly academic fields: they may not have the time or wish to expend the funds to go to national conventions; they do not catch the fancy of the nominating committees for the presidency; or they may perhaps not wish to accept the presidency, with its responsibility.

To some extent Odum has himself realized the deficiencies of his plan, and so he has devoted a third section of seven chapters to brief discussions of various specialties in sociology, giving the dates, titles, and authors (with their scholastic affiliation) of the publications in each field. Brief appraisals of the subject rather than personalities are given here, but occasionally such important scholars as Maurice Reea Davie, not included as a president, are given some brief notice. One is glad Odum, who treated himself objectively and somewhat too briefly, in the presidential sequence, gives more details of his ideas under the topic of races (p. 326) and regionalism (pp. 356-360). In this section there are so many lists of publications, names, and theories, that defects are bound to be present. Catholics will miss Father Furfey's *History of Social Thought* of 1942; the present reviewer's books are listed only to 1939 (with credit given to Trinity College although she did not become affiliated to it until 1940), and omitting *Belgian Rural Cooperation*, 1940; *Sound Social Living*, 1941; *Sociology and Social Problems*, 1948. Dr. Ruth Reed, who has been at the Catholic University since 1935, has only one of her books mentioned: the *Modern Family* of 1929, with her affiliation given as Mount Holyoke. Doubtless these and many other such minutiae will be corrected in a second printing.

Section Four provides some details of regional groupings of sociologists and other social scientists, with the names of past presidents. It is gratifying to find the *American Catholic Sociological Society* is given a place here, and that in a later chapter on sociological journals, the *ASCR* is included. In the list of presidents of the District of Columbia Chapter of the American Sociological Society one misses the name of the late Percy A. Robert of the Catholic University who, to this reviewer's recollection and that of others, was certainly a president, although none of us remembers the precise year. Here and there in this section a few writers not mentioned elsewhere, such as Harry Elmer Barnes and Charles S. Johnson, are given some attention.

The Fifth section: *Toward Inventory* makes a brief summary of the book, with some reference to future trends.

Undoubtedly this is a book which all sociologists need for their library, and which will provide a major work of reference for students for many years to come. Such tremendous amount of work has gone into its making, and the material it contains is so valuable, that any finding of flaws seems petty indeed. Yet the major flaws of the book have already been indicated. The work of some important sociologists has been merely referred to or omitted entirely, due to the planning, even though this planning has its very great advantages and one must compliment the author on his imagination here. So many lists of names and works necessarily has led to typographical errors and some omissions or other small inaccuracies. Some of the major trends in modern sociology in the United States do not seem to be emphasized as they might. By allowing some of the past presidents to speak for themselves some occasional "gaffs" occur, even though there is a charm about this manner of presentation, and Odum's personal reminiscences about some of the presidents will delight even the seasoned reader. When students in the United States use this book, friends or instructors can easily call attention to what might be rectified. It is sociologists abroad who need a further chapter or essay to point out important missing names and trends.

EVA J. ROSS

Trinity College, Washington 17, D. C.

The Sociology of Knowledge. By Jacques J. Maquet. Translated by John F. Locke. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1951. Pp. xix + 318. \$5.00.

First published in French by the Louvain Institute de Recherches Economiques et Sociales, this excellent study was reviewed in these pages in March 1950. The work now appears in translation, and is one of the few books at present available in English devoted to one of the increasingly important branches of sociological inquiry. Although the author gives special attention to the work of Mannheim and Sorokin, he presents here a comprehensive examination of the whole idea of a sociology of knowledge and of its relation to the philosophy of knowledge. What gives the study a special interest for Catholic sociologists is the effort to determine the exact character of the sociology of knowledge, and to see how it is related to the philosophical evaluation of human knowledge in the light of the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas.

As an empirical investigation of the influence exercised upon man's thinking activity by socio-cultural factors, the sociology of knowledge, like other factual inquiries, aims to discover uniformities and regularities and to develop explanatory hypotheses. It must, therefore, be distinguished from the philosophical

inquiry into the nature of human thought with a view to determining its character and its value. This has, unfortunately, not always been done, with the result that the sociology of knowledge is sometimes mistaken for a complete explanation of why we think as we do, thus making it impossible to explain the fact that human thinking unavoidably claims to transcend socio-cultural limitations. A theory of socio-cultural relativism cannot make good its own claim to being a complete account of knowledge without thereby becoming unfaithful to its own relativist premises, as Dr. Maquet succeeds very well in showing. Within its own proper limits of empirical inquiry, however, this recent addition to sociological investigation can have something of value to contribute to better understanding among men by removing some of the obstacles which hinder such understanding.

ERNEST KILZER, O.S.B.

St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn.

Social Movements. By Rudolph Heberle. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951. Pp. xiii+478. \$4.00.

Subtitled "An Introduction to Political Sociology," this treatise proposes to provide the student with the theoretical tools he will need in order to analyze and understand any social movement. In this respect, it differs radically from previous textbooks on the subject which have confined themselves largely to sketching the history of specific social movements.

The method is largely one of rational analysis, although a courteous nod to "scientific" procedure is given in the section devoted to ecology and methods of quantitative analysis; there is little visible relation between this section and the rest of the book. This can be explained, of course, by the difficulty of measuring with any exactitude the many facets of social movements and the consequent inadequacy of empirical studies in this field.

Despite this handicap, which will lead some to classify the work as speculation rather than science, Heberle has made a distinct contribution in systematizing the "general principles" governing the ideas, the social foundations, the structure and organization, and the tactics and strategy of social movements and political parties. The principles are not stated in dogmatic fashion; rather, they are presented with qualifications implying that the author would welcome their submission to empiric test.

As the subtitle indicates, the emphasis is on political movements, or social movements which eventuated in political parties; thus, nazism, fascism, communism, and democracy furnish most of the illustrations. Within the compass of one volume, this is certainly adequate. But one would like to see a companion volume devoted to an analysis of social movements not primarily political in nature such as the feminist, cooperative, Buchman-

ite, adult education, and euthanasia movements, to mention but a few.

Of the books in the field, and there are not many, this is probably the most satisfactory for a graduate course in social movements.

GERALD J. SCHNEPP, S.M.

Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Mo.

The Meaning of Civilization. By Bohdan Chuboda. New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons, 1951. Pp. xi+314. \$4.00.

Dr. Chuboda, professor of history at Iona College, presents a rather impassioned treatment of, and plea for, a Christian conception of history and progress. His starting point is the thesis that the historian's "primary subject" is "the creative activity of man as an individual personality." Before examining the pre-Christian and Christian culture in this light, the author takes to task the culture historian's interest in regularities and the historian's interest in history as a science, the lack of adequate distinction between culture and civilization, and the modern obsession with the idea of progress.

In the section on the "Ancient Background," the origins of culture, tribes and empires, arts and science, and the religious developments of the ancients are presented in a weighty seventy pages. This study of the value systems of the ancients has as its purpose to ferret out the elements which have been diffused to the Christian culture. In the third and last section, "Aspects of Christian Culture" in the light of "the tremendous event of Our Lord's Incarnation" are reviewed. The last chapter entitled "Hope and Despair in Modern Society" places emphasis on despair but the ultimate victory of Christ is not doubted.

Limits of this review permit only a few critical remarks. The usual methodological and scholarly shortcomings of such an attempt at a philosophy of history are found also in this monograph. Many American readers will disagree with Chuboda's use of such concepts as civilization ("dead civilization"), culture ("living civilization"), capitalistic ("all the economic systems of the modern epoch") and money ("simple medium of exchange"). Christian social philosophers' use of this work will have to be supplemented by the writings of Maritain, Sturzo, and Dawson.

CHESTER A. JURCAK

Duquesne University, Pittsburgh 19, Pa.

Social Philosophies of an Age of Crisis. By Pitirim A. Sorokin. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1950. Pp. xi+345. \$4.00.

By the time a review appears for one of Sorokin's books, he is usually out with another of his prolific productions. This present work therefore does not represent the latest of Sorokin's

thinking, and in fact, contains very little that is not familiar to readers of his *Social and Cultural Dynamics*, and his *Society, Culture and Personality*.

Sorokin offers this, nevertheless, as a companion volume for his *Contemporary Sociological Theories*, which it is supposed to supplement. In some respects, the treatment does resemble that in the *Theories*. Perhaps the most substantial contribution that the book makes is its series of usable summaries of outstanding works like Danilevsky's *Russia and Europe*, Spengler's *Decline of the West*, Toynbee's *Study of History*, Schubart's *Europe and the Soul of the East*, Schweitzer's *Philosophy of Civilization*, Northrup's *Meeting of the East and the West*, and Kroeber's *Configurations of Culture*. For anyone interested in the philosophy of history, or the sociology of culture, these works form, with Sorokin's, a basic non-Catholic bibliography. Sorokin's disdain for Catholic thinkers in the field, such as Jacques Maritain, Christopher Dawson, and Andrew Krzesinski, is shown by his complete silence in their regard.

The current volume also, as a product of the Harvard Research Center in Creative Altruism, differs from the *Theories* in the tone and temper of its criticisms. In place of the sledgehammer demolition tactics of the former work, one finds a mild-mannered consideration of points of difference and areas of agreement between Sorokin and his fellow philosophers of history. Perhaps his post-sociological phase has had a softening influence on him, and has evoked the display of some of the altruism he is now analysing and preaching.

Most of the criticisms are but repetitions of those found in *Society, Culture and Personality*. The Harvard sage finds flaws in the excessive use of the organismic analogy by thinkers like Danilevsky, Toynbee and Spengler. He also objects to Northrup's oversimplified typology, and his insistence on the interdependence of philosophy and natural science in any given age.

The final section of the book, "Towards a Valid Social Philosophy," shows nothing more than the points of agreement between these theorists and Sorokin's own pet preconceptions. If his were valid, this would represent some progress toward a basic social philosophy to guide humanity in the dark night of its soul. As it stands, however, the book simply surveys a group of impotent thinkers, all equally lost in the darkness.

ALBERT S. FOLEY, S.J.

Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Mo.

The Claims of Sociology: A Critique of Textbooks. By A. H. Hobbs, Harrisburg: The Stackpole Company, 1951. Pp. vi+185. \$2.75.

Professor Hobbs' study is certain to arouse controversy among sociologists. The author analyzed 83 non-sectarian textbooks in introductory sociology, social problems, and the family,

for topics which could influence the readers' personal behavior, attitudes on personal behavior, or behavior and attitudes in relation to actual social conditions. His conclusion: these "non-sectarian" books are most sectarian in that studies are selected to conform to the biases of the authors. Among these biases are a belief in more governmental control of business, the non-harmful effects of divorce, favorable disposition toward greater secularization of religion, advocacy of birth control, and a minimizing of the influence of heredity. Catholic texts have also been studied and will be considered in a future publication. Catholic sociologists will find in this book detailed proof of what they have long suspected or known about reputedly "non-sectarian" textbooks.

At times, however, the author appears to strain too hard to make a case which might have been made with less effort. Perhaps the section on economics is the least satisfactory. Professor Hobbs asks:

Is it scientifically justifiable to present "minimum subsistence" or "poverty" levels (which are based on urban families of four) to the entire population, when considerably less than half of this population is compelled to distribute its income among four persons? (p. 80)

Technically, this statement is correct but Professor Hobbs fails to mention that almost six million families out of a total of about 39 million had three or more children, and thus had to distribute income among more than four. Furthermore, if family income is considered in terms of individuals within the family among whom it must be divided, families of three persons or less amounted to 61,862,000 while families of four or more accounted for 61,747,000 persons in 1949. (Current population reports, "Consumer Income," U.S. Department of Commerce, 1951, p. 22). It is true this is less than half but not considerably less. This would leave about twenty-six million persons in the population to be accounted for. Some of these are children over eighteen who are still being supported by parents but because of age do not appear in the statistics; perhaps some are aged persons also supported by families. Despite occasional lapses this book should perform a real service for sociology and on the basis of this study, Catholic authors may begin to wonder if only their books should be considered "sectarian."

JOHN J. KANE

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.

Morals and Man in the Social Sciences. By J. V. Langmead Casserley. New York: Longmans Green and Co., 1951. Pp. ix+230. 12/6 net.

Testament for Social Science. By Barbara Wootton, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1950. Pp. vi+197. \$3.00.

Can the recent developments in the social sciences, particularly in sociology, be reconciled from the standpoint of theory and empirical findings, with the Christian concept of man? In Langmead Casserley's brilliant essay we have a profound and scholarly discussion of this problem. He is concerned with what he considers "the two sensitive points on the long common frontier between theology and the social sciences, the interpretation of ethics and the evaluation of man" (p. 3), and accordingly his book is divided into two parts, *Morals in the Social Sciences* and *Man in the Social Sciences*. The first part is concerned with ethical relativism as reflected in the social sciences and the extent to which Christian ethics can come to terms with it; he rightly maintains that Christian ethics does justice to all that is valid in relativism. The second part, which sociologists will be particularly interested in, contains such chapters as *The Origins and Axioms of Modern Sociology*, *Rationality in the Social Sciences*, *Freedom in the Social Sciences*, and *Personality in the Social Sciences*. Here he considers sociological concepts, such as ideology and personality, and discusses their implications for the Christian concepts of freedom and rationality. In the course of the argument he discusses sociology, its axioms and methodology, and one can hear echoes of the best in the sociological literature.

His general conclusion is that Christian realism has less to fear from the social sciences than the various brands of secular idealism and humanism. It is unfortunate that this book has received such little attention in sociological circles; it deserves to be discussed widely and more thoroughly than this short review permits.

Although Barbara Wootton is concerned fundamentally with the problem of scientific method and its application to human affairs, she makes unfortunate excursions into fields like metaphysics and religion. Her chief difficulty is that she confuses the different levels of scientific inquiry. For her, scientific inquiry is the only accepted method of advancing our knowledge, but the only type of inquiry deserving of the name "scientific" is that used by the natural sciences. She admits that the scientific method is limited — science can not answer all questions — but she maintains that to those questions for which there is no "scientific" answer there is no answer.

She commits an error, not uncommon in the social sciences. Because religious experiences now accepted as communion with God may be found also to be associated with purely human events, she argues they will therefore be explicable on an entirely godless hypothesis. As a matter of fact religious experiences are often associated with purely human events; it does not follow that they are explained thereby. As long as Barbara Wootton remains on the sociological level of investigation, she makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of social science and its problems in application; whenever she decides

to apply the scientific method as she understands it to questions basically non-sociological, however, we must perforce take her own word for it — she writes as an amateur (p. v).

RUSSELL BARTA

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.

Survey of Social Science. By Marion B. Smith. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951. Pp. xxii+743. \$5.00.

A one-volume attempt to survey the social sciences is always of interest. A full-year undergraduate course at Louisiana State University, entitled "General Social Science," fostered this text which "attempts to describe man's life with particular emphasis on life in America at the present time, contrasted, at times, with life in other cultures" (p. vii). While not really an introduction to the subjects of anthropology, economics, government, psychology, or sociology, as separate fields of human life, this text does try to emphasize the part each plays in the integrated pattern of human culture. Without discussing the difficult theoretical problems involved in trying to integrate the social sciences, a simple, factual survey is presented. "Human Development," "Population Composition and Distribution," "Culture Change," and a discussion of a variety of "Social Institutions" provide the major subdivisions of the text. A fuller use of the "great books" in the various subject matter areas would have given more depth to this otherwise well organized survey.

JOHN MEANY

Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Sociology and Social Problems in Nursing Service. By Gladys Sellew and Paul Hanly Furfey. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1951. Pp. xiii+391. \$3.75.

The extension of medical care to a greater proportion of our people produces not only better health services but also new and special relationships within the wider community as well as within the more restricted areas of hospital society. In recognition of this interdependence, more attention is now directed toward the education of the nurse in the social aspects of her vocation. One of the most valuable contributions to this field of sociological literature is the text written by Dr. Gladys Sellew and Dr. Paul Hanly Furfey which follows the general outline of the *Curriculum Guide for Schools of Nursing*.

For both instructor and student the succinct outline of sociology and social trends in nursing service and of medical social problems of the community will be a useful guide to the elementary course. Although the authors at times draw heavily upon other texts, the greater part of the book is distinctively their own. Their competence and experience appear in the use of apt illustrations, tables and charts, the careful choice of topics for discussion, and the selective bibliographies for the various chap-

ters, as well as in the glossary and additional data on social legislation in the appendix.

The reader may regret a few typographical errors that mar the work, and may wonder why the authors included the material on anthropology and excluded the establishment of morale and rapport between the nurse and her patient. No mention is made of the zeal of the Ladies of Charity although they represent the volunteer social work activities of lay groups within the Church. But in general the book is a clear and satisfying text, a good introduction for the lay reader, and a requirement for any good library in sociology.

MARGARET MARY TOOLE

Lenox, Mass.

Marriage Education and Counseling. Edited by Alphonse H. Clemens. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1951. Pp. vi+153. \$2.50.

Professor Clemens has assembled papers given at Workshops on Marriage and the Family and from the Cana Institute conducted at Catholic University in 1947, 1948, 1949 and 1950. The book is divided into two sections, the first of which deals with education for marriage, family origins, religious aspects of marriage, mixed marriage, and Cana techniques. The second section treats certain problems and techniques in marriage counseling such as the types of interviews, frigidity, and psychological tests.

One of the best chapters is "Marriage As a State of Religious Perfection" by Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R. Father Connell deals with early attitudes of the Church fathers toward marriage and explains their stand. He then goes on to a consideration of marriage as a state of perfection. John W. Stafford's treatment of psychological tests is another excellent chapter. He reviews some of the more widely known marital prediction scales and comments on Ellis' evaluation of them. John L. Thomas' article on the pattern of marriage among Catholics contains a brief historical discussion of mixed religious marriage and a picture of such marriages today. Father Thomas points out that there is a negative correlation between the percentage of Catholics and the percentage of mixed marriages in a diocese, a statement that is generally but not universally true. This book should prove valuable reading for all parish priests and could be used as a basic text or collateral reading in courses on marriage counseling.

JOHN J. KANE

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.

The Practice of Marriage Counselling. By Emily Hartshorne Mudd. New York: Association Press, 1951, Pp. 336. \$4.50.

Of the four English books on "Marriage Counselling," Dr. Mudd's work is by far the best. One is impressed by the painstaking research entailed in accumulating the factual data rela-

tive to the known marriage counselling services in the nation and to the operational aspects of the Marriage Council of Philadelphia. These two sets of data comprise most of the book and provide a veritable encyclopedia of information about the trend and current status of this emerging profession in this country. One might wish that having exerted the effort to survey these many agencies, the author had pushed out the frontiers of her investigation somewhat further so as to include some of the extremely useful disclosures of the Marriage Council of Philadelphia's experiences, and from other counselling agencies as well.

If Dr. Mudd has brought to her study a preoccupation with the social work approach to marriage counselling, doubtless it is due to her early training and experience. Some would have preferred a clean distinction made between those agencies practicing as autonomous marriage counsellors and those in which marriage counselling is a mere component of other and pre-existing services and professions.

The detailed analysis of the operation of the Marriage Council of Philadelphia provides an excellent case study. It should prove useful to all students of the subject and especially to those engaged in or anticipating the initiation of such services. It is to be hoped that Dr. Mudd's pioneer effort will stimulate similar studies of the practical aspects of marriage counselling.

It is regrettable that a work as eminently deserving of commendation as this, should have disrupted its empirical findings with excursions into the realm of unscientific hypotheses. Such asides as positing the statement that masturbation is in no way unnatural, are, however, infrequent. On the other hand, one would have welcomed a further treatment of the statement that the philosophy of counselling is the most important factor in marriage guidance.

Despite its few inadequacies, this book represents the first sincere attempt to inform us factually about the current status of Marriage Counselling. It is, as such, an excellent reference work needed not only for those only casually interested but also for those professionally a part of this emerging profession.

A. H. CLEMENS

Marriage Counselling Center
Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D.C.

Contemporary Correction. Edited by Paul W. Tappan. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951. Pp. xvii+434. \$5.50.

The scope and breadth of this volume plus the inclusion of so many authorities makes its place in a sociology or social library almost mandatory. Besides the editor, its authors include such familiar names as Bates, Bennett, Reckless, and Ellingston, among a total of 32 contributors.

The subject-matter of the work is divided into five major areas: Correction; Preliminary Considerations; Administrative Organization and Classification; Programs in the Correctional Institution; Types of Correctional Institutions (both adult and juvenile); and Extramural Treatment. All but the last of the 26 chapters has a short bibliography.

Of special interest, because of the increasing emphasis on it in recent years, is chapter 18, "Prison Architecture and Function," authored by two architects for correctional institutions. Also of value, for a similar reason, are the chapters in the section on Administrative Organization and Classification dealing with Reception Centers and the Service Unit; as well as the chapters in the section on Programs, which discuss Medical Services, Psychiatric, Psychological, and Case-work Services, Group Therapy, and Religion and the Chaplain.

The book suffers from a number of self-imposed restrictions. With the exception of a few chapters, the emphasis is on *contemporary* correction, with little or no space given to historical backgrounds. Furthermore, in a work of this breadth, it is obvious that depth must be sacrificed somewhat; most chapters have space enough to sketch merely the broad outlines of the subject under discussion. Finally, the book, made up as it is of contributed chapters, suffers to some extent from lack of unity.

Nonetheless, it is safe to predict that this work will receive a deservedly widespread use as a text and reference book.

DONALD J. THORMAN

Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y.

Behavior Pathology. By Norman Cameron and Ann Magaret. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951. Pp. xvi+645. \$5.00.

The average untrained person is inclined to categorize deviant or socially unacceptable human behavior as incomprehensible; unique pathological or personality patterns are therefore considered esoteric. The authors have successfully correlated the essential similarity between normal, everyday behavior and exaggerated distorted reactions; and have thus brought these interesting problems within the reach of the average individual. Precise and concise definitions and examples are freely and intelligently utilized; and wise therapeutic principles are clarified.

Although *Behavior Pathology* attempts to discuss the total human being, yet it has fallen short of that goal. One very essential factor is missing — that of the effect of Religion on that human being. Psychologically and psychiatrically, the principles discussed and illustrated are basically sound; however, man is a rational animal with a soul; and if the *whole* man is to be studied, then all the factors affecting his life should be made the subject of study. *Behavior Pathology* has a definite message not only for the professional but also for the average

layman; however, that message has become somewhat garbled in its transmission due to the omission of that essential factor.

RAYMOND M. GRUMMELL

United States Probation Office, South Bend 24, Ind.

The Social History of a War Boom Community. By Robert J. Havighurst and H. Gerthron Morgan. New York: Longmans Green and Co., 1951. Pp. xix+356. \$4.00.

The American Veteran Back Home: A Study of Veteran Readjustment. By Robert J. Havighurst, Walter H. Eaton, John W. Baughman, Ernest W. Burgess. New York: Longmans Green and Co., 1951. Pp. xiv+271. \$3.50.

The similarities between these research efforts justify a single review. For both, Dr. Havighurst of the University of Chicago's Committee on Human Development appears to be the guiding spirit. Both deal with significant aspects of the impact of World War II upon American communities. Finally, there is an obvious line of common descent from earlier studies conducted by W. Lloyd Warner and his associates, a familial tie that does not always show to best advantage.

"War boom" Seneca, Illinois, experienced a five-fold increase in population over a two-year period due to the location there of a shipyard. The cessation of that project brought a sudden return to near normalcy completing a period of extreme social change with attendant demands for the adjustment of people and of institutions. The author's attempts to describe and evaluate these adjustments are undoubtedly the most valuable contribution of the book.

In the study of the returned veterans of "Midwest," the major focus is upon individual adjustment, except for two chapters devoted to the community setting and wartime morale and one other dealing with servicemen's wives. Chapters describing job, family, and personal adjustments and a special study of the "pre-adult veteran" are the sections most closely related to the area defined by the title, and for the most part, are quite rewarding.

"Midwest" is apparently another name for "Elmtown" and "Jonesville." Seneca is located ten to fifteen miles distant. The relationship between these studies, however, is more than one of territorial proximity. Much of the methodological emphasis is placed upon status comparisons and measurements previously developed by the Warner group. The Seneca study strikes this reviewer as a grim warning of how this approach can be misused. In determining the crucial status structure, no clue is given as to how many raters were employed, how well qualified they were to speak with objectivity, or what criteria they used. Both studies depend too much on "typical" illustrative cases. There are times when one may question whether these are results of

scientific observation or a literary blending of hearsay and conjecture. Many of the "typical" biographies or comments lack the ring of authenticity, a failing not relieved by occasional flights into obvious rhetoric.

From the standpoint of overall conceptualization of the important problems attacked, the studies are brilliantly organized. In spite of the deficiencies noted, they constitute valuable additions to the growing list of community studies with the "Veteran" emerging as the more impressive accomplishment.

GORDON C. ZAHN

The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

The Social Welfare Forum, 1951. By the Editorial Committee, National Conference of Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. Pp. xvi+380. \$5.00.

The vast content of social welfare and work and the interest in it are evidenced in this latest record. It is one of three volumes of proceedings of the 78th annual conference, held in Atlantic City. This particular volume contains all the papers presented at general meetings as well as selected papers from particular sections and interest groups. "Building Social Welfare for Democracy" was the 1951 theme.

The editorial committee did an admirable job. When a person attends a multi-focused meeting he always has the problem of trying to put together the parts into one whole. He wants the common elements as well as the differences in the offerings of the participants. Seldom is he able to get much beyond piecemeal enlightenment on the main idea. Consequently, the attending member as well as the absent relies on the record.

The material selected by the committee provides a masterful cross-cut of the ideas presented by able raconteurs. I believe, too, the editors have fed into the archives valuable data indicative of the predominant objectivity and over-all democracy, together with some of the inevitable bias and prejudice and propaganda, which make the National Conference one of the sincerest meetings of professional social scientists and their fellows.

These latest annuals re-echo an acute and often overwhelming challenge to the scholastic intellect and temper. Keep in mind that most papers presented at the conference are written thoughtfully. In a sense the papers are scientific manuscripts. Is it not astonishing, then, to find such free and confident expression of untenable, pragmatic philosophy as is found in many of the papers? After all, pure science is one of the strongest refutations of pragmatism.

Nevertheless, as a realistic record, large and worthy, as a volume of significant reports on current social welfare and work, "*The Social Welfare Forum, 1951*," is forthrightly and enthusiastically recommended to every social scientist.

LUCIAN L. LAUERMAN

National Catholic School of Social Service, Washington 17, D. C.

Progrès Scientifique et Service Social. Compte rendu de la 7e Conference catholique internationale de Service Social. Bruxelles: Union Catholique Internationale de Service Social, 1950. Pp. 195.

In Rome, on September 7-13, 1950, with a papal letter of approbation and appreciation, the members of the *UCISS* led the sessions of their Congress with emphasis on the requirements for social service, namely, Christian fidelity and professional competence. The proceedings of these sessions offer a brief treatment of the work done, the methods used and the program of study followed in the Western Schools of Social Work. Of particular interest to psychologists and sociologists is the report to the conference given by Father Donceel, S.J., on "Depth Psychology and Social Service." The place of depth psychology in the Christian conception of man and the method and philosophy of Freud's psychology are treated with unsurpassed ability.

The remaining reports particularly emphasize the necessity of case work with its special technique, and the importance of the study of the following sciences: physiology, psychiatry, psychology, ethics, and sociology.

The specific aim of the Union is Catholic social service, as is clearly evidenced in its motto, "The Son of man did not come to be served but to serve." The general resolution brought forth by the seven commissions, representing several countries, posits the necessity of protecting the integrity and unity of the family, the basic unit of society.

SISTER MARIE AGNES OF ROME

Rivier College, Nashua, N. H.

The Children of Hari: A Study of the Nimar Balahis in the Central Provinces of India. By Stephen Fuchs. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1951. Pp. xviii+463. \$7.50.

The millions of India's "untouchables" have received scant attention in anthropological literature. Father Stephen Fuchs, S.V.D., gives us one of the first full-dress accounts of a low caste people, the Balahis of Nimar, C. P. In his sympathetic and purely ethnographic account he very wisely refrains from discussing the origins of the untouchable castes in India.

The Balahis, of extremely heterogeneous origin, are an Austro-Asiatic caste near the bottom of India's complicated social and economic ladder. The caste has several endogamous subdivisions arranged territorially and hierarchically and subdivided into exogamous clans. The joint families within the clans are ruled quite despotically by the old patriarch. Although the Balahis observe the Hindu criminal and civil code they eat beef and drink liquor. Each village has an elected caste council which has supreme authority. Ostracism by the caste council, unless removed by repentance and payment of penalties, may be the

equivalent of a living death. As the Balahi is quite "ignorant of any definite system of moral precepts, the regulative power in his moral life is fear of public opinion and an eventual punishment by the caste community."

Centuries of oppression, serfdom, starvation, squalor, and disease, have made the Balahis "mean, ignorant, fatalistic, dirty and dull." The understatement of the book is Fuch's summary: "The Balahis are not a charming people" (p. 435). If this is so "it is not all their fault." The author makes an urgent appeal for some solution to the problem of the sixty million untouchables of India. "The problem of untouchability is a very complex one, and all the foundations underlying it must be attacked at the same time in an all-out effort if success is to be assured." More than good will and the unrealistic Harijan Movement of a Mahatma Gandhi will be needed to "uplift" the untouchables of India.

SYLVESTER A. SIEBER, S.V.D.

Loyola University, Chicago 11, Ill.

Art of the Northwest Coast Indians. By Robert Bruce Inverarity. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950. Pp. xiv+243. 279 Plates. \$10.00.

Primitive Art, whether of the unconscious naive variety of a Grandma Moses or of the modern sophisticates, Picasso (African sculpture), Paul Klee (Oceanian art) and Henry Moore (Middle America) who have taken their inspiration from the arts of genuine primitives, seems to be riding a wave of popularity today. In all of those, certain characteristics typical of the art of primitive people appear. The most striking of these, found also in Northwest Coast art, are "portrayal of things unseen," "distortion or overemphasis," "distorted perspective," "outlining," "condensation," and "horror vacui."

The totem poles of the Northwest Coast are well known. However, besides their wood and painted wood carvings, the Indians also worked in stone, weaving, and basketry. Their art was already flourishing in 1778 when Captain Cook made his last visit to this area. At the turn of the century a decline set in and at present the art is dead.

Inverarity has gathered these excellent representations from the best collections in the U. S. and Canada. The author has wisely prefaced the plates with some fifty pages of cultural description of the highly complex way of life of the Northwest Coast Indians.

The most noteworthy carvings are memorial columns, inside and outside house posts, and mortuary columns. The famous Chilkat blanket is surprisingly similar in technique to Peruvian textiles. Anthropologists and artists will welcome this most complete collection of Northwest Coast primitive art.

SYLVESTER A. SIEBER, S.V.D.

Loyola University, Chicago 11, Ill.

SHORT NOTICES

Pioneer in Purple. By George Boyle. Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1951. Pp. xi+290. \$3.50.

The life of Archbishop Neil McNeil (1851-1934) is closely intertwined with the development of Canada. Whether he was teaching at Antigonish, serving as parish priest in the maritime provinces or as a member of the hierarchy in St. George, Vancouver, or Toronto, he manifested a far-seeing leadership in the solution of religious and social problems and an understanding of the need for community cooperation in ameliorating the French-English differences which have plagued Canada throughout its history.

George Boyle has written a sympathetic biography, wisely letting his subject do much of the talking through the judicious selection of excerpts from correspondence, sermons, articles, and interviews. The fifty-page Appendix contains documents prepared by the Archbishop, including perhaps his greatest pastoral letter, on "The Catholic Home."

Sociologists will find much pertinent material here. Archbishop McNeil was a staunch advocate of a positive program to meet the challenge of totalitarianism; he trod a careful path in a strongly prejudiced community; he promoted cooperatives, social justice in the schools, and the rights of labor; he clarified, and urged others to clarify, the concept of charity; he encouraged the Baroness de Hueck and the Friendship Houses. In short, this is a book which will help Americans understand their neighbor to the north and the place of the Church in its development.

Scholarships, Fellowships and Loans. Volume II. By S. Norman Feingold. Boston: Bellman Publishing Co., Inc., 1951. Pp. 312. \$5.00.

Students, college administrators, and vocational counselors owe a debt of gratitude to the author and publisher for this catalogue of over 7,000 aids administered by 245 separate agencies ranging from Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., to Zeta Psi Educational Foundation. Three indexes are provided: a subject index for the editorial section; an agency index; and an index by vocational goals and fields of interest. Every high school and college counselor should have a copy and copies should be available in libraries for student use.

The Face of the Heavenly Mother. By Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. Translated from the German by Charles Donahue. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. 150. \$3.00.

A brief Mariology forms the core of this book, Cardinal Mindszenty's second on motherhood. Outstanding mothers of the Old and New Testaments are treated in the first two chapters, while the last chapters are devoted to heroic mothers who followed in the footsteps of the Mother of God. Among these, special attention is given to St. Monica. There is a concluding chapter on Mother Church.

While the author dedicated his book primarily to mothers and to young women who hope to be mothers, he intended it also for all who still reverence women in their heart. He expressed the hope in his preface that his efforts would make three stars — Mother, Church, Homeland — shine more brightly. The once imprisoned prelate's book is another stirring reminder to all who hope to build the world anew that they must look to Mary, the Mother of God.

New Horizons in Criminology, (2d edition). By Harry Elmer Barnes and Negley K. Teeters. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951. Pp. xvi+887. \$5.95.

In this second edition of a widely used text, new chapters have been added on prison architecture, prison health and recreation services, and Youth and Adult Authorities, and many statistical presentations have been brought up to date. About 40 per cent of the space is devoted to Book I, "Criminology," and the remainder to Book II, "Penology."

Sociologists will regret that the authors did not see fit to devote more space to theory by including, for example, some discussion of Sutherland's theory of differential association. The treatment of religion and crime is fairly satisfactory if the sections on religion (Pp. 183 ff.) and the prison chaplain (Pp. 662 ff.) are read in conjunction. Reference to Catholic studies of the subject, however, would have enriched this section as also that devoted to free will; in the latter, for example, some reference might have been made to the Coogan-Barnes discussions in *Federal Probation* (1943-44).

If the instructor is looking for an excellent description of the practical aspects presented in an up-to-date and readable manner, this volume is probably without peer; but it is less than adequate on theory.

Soviet Attitudes Towards Authority. By Margaret Mead. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951. Pp. 148. \$4.00.

This book is, in the words of its author, "a report on an interdisciplinary group approach to the study of certain aspects of Soviet attitude towards authority." The second chapter describes the methods and materials used by the representatives of the various social sciences. At the end of the chapter, we learn the central question of the entire study: How do the Bolsheviks maintain control of the Russian people and what is the probable future of their power structure?

Unfortunately, the question proved easier to propose than to answer satisfactorily. Perhaps, if the work were longer, it would have actually achieved the goal which the Rand Corporation research group had set itself. As it stands, individual sections merit attention. But the ordinary student will find its central question more simply and more effectively analyzed elsewhere.

WILLIAM A. NOLAN

PERIODICAL REVIEWS

GORDON C. ZAHN, *Editor*

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

Gemelli, Agostino, O.F.M., "*Psicoanalisi e Cattolicesimo*" (Psychoanalysis and Catholicism), *Vita E Pensiero*, May 1950, pp. 245-254.

To the question whether the Catholic can turn to psychoanalysis for either didactic of therapeutic purposes, Agostino Gemelli, the noted Italian criminologist, answers firmly and definitely in the negative. In an article which caused considerable comment in Italy, Gemelli answered a question that arose only comparatively recently for Italians. Due to the restrictions that fascism imposed upon disciplines like psychology and sociology, Italian scholarship had to wait until the overthrow of fascism made possible a return to the path of free investigation from which it was forced in the early Twenties. It is only since World War II that Italy has really become widely aware of psychoanalysis, large because French, English and American influences have helped the psychoanalytic movement to achieve some importance.

While Gemelli accepts Freud's importance as a contributor to the understanding of the dynamics of human behavior, he notes that a number of French Catholics and some French Catholic periodicals have more or less uncritically accepted the tenets of psychoanalysis. He claims that the analysts have grossly confused pathological feelings of guilt and the judgments that must accompany men's actions and which occasion a far different kind of guilt. To point out this confusion, says Gemelli, is not to interject philosophy into a scientific discussion, but merely to recall the elementary psychological fact that feelings are quite different from judgments. His main point is that psychoanalysis inevitably implies an imposition of the analyst's ideas and values upon the patient with a consequent impairing of the patient's right to make his own choices and his responsibility for doing so. Gemelli has indicated a very real psychological consequence of the analytic method. While the extent to which a patient is so affected will depend upon the individual case, something essential in the personality is changed, and this can have important social and moral effects.

Gemelli holds that although the resolution of neuroses is desirable, the liberty from conflict and the security that are based upon transference are obtained at the high cost of man's sense of proper responsibility and his liberty to act in a truly independent manner. The conclusion that he reaches is that "... the Catholic cannot adhere to psychoanalytic doctrines, he cannot accept them, he cannot submit himself to psychoanalytic treatment. . . ." In saying this Gemelli is opposing an important current in French Catholic intellectual life, but his stature as one of Europe's most prominent psychologists gives his arguments an importance that cannot be ignored.

CHARLES T. O'REILLY

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana

Wolfers, Arnold, "The Pole of Power and the Pole of Indifference," *World Politics*, 4(1): 39-63. October 1951.

Current American interest in the theory of international relations was kindled during the 1930's as part of the reaction against the excessive optimism of the Wilsonian idealists. The principal impetus for a more realistic appraisal of the workings of the international order originated in academic circles. Taking a cue from Machiavelli, the realists based their thought on the proposition that "states seek to enhance their power" (p. 40) because states, like men, are motivated by desires of domination or security.

Opposition to the realists' view has been provided by the public pronouncements of American statesmen as well as by many concrete proposals designed to reform international society. Idealist theory is founded upon the "common values which men hold as individuals" (p. 45) and the corollary that peoples are prevented from achieving international peace by the operation of power politics. As Professor Wolfers points out, both schools are interested in power but, "while the realist is primarily interested in the quest for power . . . as the essence of politics among nations, the idealist is concerned above all with its elimination" (p. 47).

Because neither theory explains satisfactorily the functioning of the international order, the author proposes a new approach which "differs from that of both the idealist and realist school by the emphasis it places on policy goals and the functional relationship existing between these goals and the quest for power" (p. 59). Thus Professor Wolfers seeks to retain the best features of both schools of thought and to discard those weak points in which their proponents fail to approximate the facts of international life. It is much too early to assess the results of this attempt to transcend the shortcomings of the principal concepts of international relations previously developed. However, there is no doubt that Professor Wolfer's approach will provide both a source of much stimulation and a new point of reference in the field to which he has already contributed so much.

DONALD E. SMITH

Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

Nuesse, C. J., "The Opinion of Catholics on Euthanasia," *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, 29-44, July 1951.

As stated by the author, the purpose of this article is "to report an estimate of the extent of non-conformity with Catholic teaching on euthanasia in selected Catholic groups." It is based on an opinion survey which has produced two articles for the *ACSR*, "Scalogram of Catholic Attitudes Toward the Negro" (T. J. Harte, C.Ss.R., June 1951) and "Differentials in Catholic Opinion on the Admission of Displaced Persons" (F. J. Dougherty and C. J. Nuesse, December 1951).

Dr. Nuesse gives a brief review of results obtained in *AIPO* polls on euthanasia conducted in 1939 and 1947. It is noted that the results of the present study indicate a far more marked opposition on the part of Catholics to euthanasia than the opposition evident in the Gallup poll.

The opinionnaire was constructed to obtain the degree of verbal conformity on the part of the respondent, together with the reasons for the

answers given. "No opinion" responses were classified as non-conforming along with the morally incorrect responses.

An analysis of results in terms of categorical responses showed that 25 per cent of the non-student group, 10 per cent of the Catholic students in Catholic colleges, and 29 per cent of the Newman Club members gave morally incorrect responses to one or more questions. Further analysis was made as to the factors possibly related to non-conformity by means of two tabulations. In the first, the proportion of non-conformists was calculated according to categories of age, sex, national descent, education, etc. The second tabulation compared the number of non-conforming responses with the number of conforming responses in terms of their percentage in each category. In interpreting the results, the author finds that, in general, (1) men show a higher degree of non-conformity than women; (2) young people — under 50 years — are more numerous in non-conforming responses than older people; (3) conformity seems to increase as the level of Catholic education increases; and (4) professional and semi-professional respondents include fewer non-conformists than do clerical, sales, and kindred workers. The reasons given indicated that 20 per cent of the non-conformists justified euthanasia on sentimental or humanitarian grounds, while some 5 per cent would judge only the subjective intention of the individuals concerned.

This article has informational value, not only for moral theologians and editors, but for sociologists interested in the further development of this major social research project in Catholic opinion study. Dr. Nuesse again points out the major limitation of the survey, an educational and occupational bias that precludes considering this as a representative sample of American Catholic population. This defect aside, the present article joins the others in the series as a valuable beginning in a very important field.

SISTER MARY VERA, R.S.M.

Mount St. Agnes College, Baltimore 9, Maryland

Murdock, George Peter, "British Social Anthropology," *American Anthropologist*, v. 53, pp. 465-473. October-December, 1951.

Firth, Raymond, "Contemporary British Social Anthropology," *Ibid.*, pp. 474-489.

Goldschmidt, Walter, "Ethics and the Structure of Society: An Ethnographic Contribution to the Sociology of Knowledge," *Ibid.*, pp. 506-524.

In varying ways, these three articles in the current *American Anthropologist* reflect the growing similarity in theory and in methodology that has been developing between sociology and social anthropology in recent decades. In the first paper, Professor Murdock of Yale presents a useful evaluation of social anthropology in England. He has fulsome praise for much of the work of his British colleagues: "... the descriptive and analytical writing of the British social anthropologists attains an average level of ethnographic competence and theoretical suggestiveness probably unequalled by any comparable group in the world" (pp. 466-467). But much of his article is devoted to a critique of the limitations of British social anthropology. Dr. Murdock finds that British work in social anthro-

polology is restricted to a rather narrow range of phenomena, chiefly kinship and related social forms; is confined almost entirely to English colonial possessions in Africa; shows little interest in general ethnography; is indifferent to the theoretical and descriptive work of anthropologists outside England; shows the indifference of students trained under Radcliffe-Brown to historical data; is uninterested in problems of social change; and reflects a widespread lack of interest in psychology. After this catalog of the shortcomings of the British school, Professor Murdock attempts to explain this state of affairs. "Sober reflection" has led him to the opinion that the British are not anthropologists but sociologists. As he puts it, "In their fundamental objectives and theoretical orientation they are affiliated rather with the sociologists. Like the sociologists, they are interested primarily in social groups and the structuring of interpersonal relations rather than in culture . . ." (p. 471).

In his companion piece, Professor Firth of the London School of Economics, after admitting the justice of most of Murdock's criticisms and commenting on some of them, discusses what he holds to be the more important issues in British social anthropology today: questions of methodology; the recently revived discussion of the relation between social anthropology and history, including the attempt to place this branch of anthropology in historiography; and the relation between social anthropology and psychology.

Walter Goldschmidt, in a highly suggestive paper, explores some of the implications for social theory of the analogies between the social structure and the ethical systems of the Yurok and Hupa tribes of Northwest California, on the one hand, and Max Weber's analysis of Western European society in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, on the other. Perhaps the most stimulating idea put forward is Goldschmidt's suggested refinement of one aspect of the structural-functional conceptual schema. Following Merton and others, Goldschmidt is led by the analysis of the Yurok-Hupa data to make a distinction between what he calls *permissive* and *requisite* functional relationships.

HAROLD P. WINCHESTER

University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Copleston, Frederick C., "Mounier, Marxism and Man," *The Month*, October 1951, pp. 199-208.

In 1932, at the age of 27, Emmanuel Mounier gave up his University teaching position to launch *Esprit* as an organ for Personalism. Most of us, however, know his thought chiefly through the book, *The Personalist Manifesto*, translated in 1938. Copleston's article is a lengthy review of *Be Not Afraid*, which, in turn, is a recent translation of two works of Mounier, who died in 1950. The first part is a translation of his *La petite peur du XXe siecle* (1948). In it Mounier speaks of the great fear which characterizes modern man. So have many others. But Mounier is important not for his diagnosis, but for his solution. He reminds us that the end of one civilization does not mean the end of the world. Nor does it help to deplore modern decadence. There is no intrinsic incompatibility between a technical civilization and Christianity. The machine can help

free the spirit of man. Mounier denounces those who would stand apart from the context of history. Christians must seek a way of life in twentieth century conditions, not glorify a romanticized past. And it is not enough to merely verbalize about the person and human values. Copleston believes that Mounier had an exaggerated faith in the actual movement of history, being influenced too much by the Marxist analysis of history.

Personalism does not radically condemn technical civilization, but neither is it to be lined up with the old reactionary individualism. This is developed in the second part of the book, which is a translation of *Qu'est ce que Le Personnalisme?* (1946). According to Mounier, "Collectivism is not at cross purposes with Personalism." But communality might be a better word, for "the collectivity we seek is a collectivity of free and responsible persons." Mounier indulges in a somewhat loose use of terms, or otherwise wishful thinking, when he holds that Marxism might be broadened in the direction of Personalism and even of Christianity. He is, of course, speaking of Marxist thought, not of totalitarian communism. And as Copleston writes: "It is one thing to say that Mounier's coquetting with Marxism was inadmissible, and it is another thing to say that Christians can legitimately sit back and content themselves with denouncing communism. There is often a great deal to be learnt from those who write in a prophetic style. . . ."

SYLVESTER THEISEN

Chestnut Hill College, Philadelphia 18, Pa.

FIRST CHOICE FOR THE FACT-FINDER

THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC ALMANAC

for 1952

Slanted for use by everyone interested in the doctrine and practices of the Church, this authoritative reference book is accurate, clearly written, simple to use. Over 800 pages of Catholic and general information. "Brings our knowledge of our religion up to date"—*Franciscan Round Table*. "Upholds the reputation for usefulness and variety acquired by its predecessors."—*Catholic Action*. Cloth-bound, \$2.50; paperbound, \$2.00.

ST. ANTHONY GUILD PRESS Dept. 4-1552 PATERSON 3, NEW JERSEY





Three Outstanding Books on Social Problems

THE SOCIOLOGY OF THE PARISH

Edited by C. J. NURSSE, Ph.D.
and THOMAS J. HARTE, C.Ss.R., Ph.D.

This unique and significant study considers the whole social character of the American parish for priests, nuns, and laymen interested in it as part of the Church and community.

It helps size up the social situation of the parish and master it — to understand economic and class structure . . . the people's work life . . . their home life . . . their recreation . . . their entire milieu and existence as human beings . . . to better reach their souls.

\$4.50

MORAL PROBLEMS IN SOCIAL WORK

CHARLES R. MCKENNEY, S.J., M.S.S.S.

As the first book to cover the field completely, this text provides the common principles necessary for a *practical* solution of the moral problems usually met by social workers. An excellent one-semester course by an author who tempers sound moral theology with understanding of the fears and doubts and needs of social workers.

\$2.50

CATHOLIC SOCIAL PRINCIPLES

JOHN F. CRONIN, S.S.

"The book is designed to meet a long-standing and very distinct need, viz., that of a well-thought-out, sound, scholarly and yet down-to-earth, readable and intelligible explanation of the social doctrine of the Church as applied to American economic life."

American Catholic Sociological Review

\$6.00

The Bruce Publishing Company
3203 Bruce Building Milwaukee 1, Wisconsin

Announcing a new textbook on

THE MODERN FAMILY: A Catholic Approach

by

JOHN J. KANE, University of Notre Dame

Table of Contents

Preface — The Family as a Social Institution — The Family in Ancient Times — Social Change — Changing Familial Roles in Contemporary American Society — Courtship and Marriage — Factors in Mate Selection — Predicting Success and Failure in Marriage — Mixed Marriages — Personality Factors in Marriage — Situational Factors Outside Family Life — Situational Factors Within Family Life — Broken Families — Reproduction — Parents and Children — The Family and the Church, School, and State — Index

A doctrinal book for Catholic students. The stress is on the "practical" aspects of the family and on factors which make for different kinds of marital adjustments. Scholarly yet readable, interesting and informative.

(Approx. 400 pp., Probably \$3.50)

WILLIAM SLOANE ASSOCIATES, Inc.

119 West 57th Street

NEW YORK 19, NEW YORK

